The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 14, 1886.

The Week.

THE task devolved upon Mr. Carlisle in the arrangement of the House committees was perhaps the most laborious and embarrassing that has fallen to the lot of any Speaker in this generation. The Democratic party has for the first time in years found itself charged with the full responsibilities of government. It comes to this task not as a united body, having a clear programme and a settled platform of principles on the leading questions of the day, but with very marked divisions in its ranks on all the leading issues. This division is so marked that the leaders of the party are not even agreed on the question what is the leading issue. Mr. Bland and Mr. Warner hold that the silver question is the most important. Mr. Morrison and Mr. Randall would assign that place to the tariff, while the President perhaps esteems the civil service the most important. And upon all these issues there are deep furrows running through the party. Mr. Carlisle was bound to recognize these differences. He was bound also to give due weight to the Republican membership and to the Republican bias on these questions. It was incumbent upon him to make the organization fairly representative of the opinions of the House as he understood them, and at the same time to avoid or minimize any elements of discord between the legislature and the executive. All this was to be accomplished by assigning to certain places on the committees which prepare legislation for the final judgment of the House, 325 men, all of whom have ideas of their own fitness more or less at variance with those of the Speaker.

At first blush this might seem to be an impossible task, no less than that of handling a kaleidoscope so that a turn of the instrument should present a predetermined picture to the eye. In the presence of so difficult a problem we think that Mr. Carlisle has done very well. His success can only be determined by the outcome. Judgment cannot be pronounced upon his work until its results are shown in legislation, but according to outward appearance he has vindicated the confidence reposed in him as a judicious and conservative statesman. The Committee on Coinage engages the larger share of public attention, and this fact goes far to settle one question of the highest gravity. It proves that the silver question *is* the leading issue of the day. It shows that the public are willing to place the tariff, the civil service, and all other things behind it and to settle that first. This is no inconsiderable gain to the cause of honest money. Two years or even one year ago it was with the greatest difficulty that Congress could be brought to consider this subject at all. The opponents of compulsory coinage could scarcely get a report from a committee in either house for or against the continuance of the coinage. The House Committee was dead against any change. The Senate Committee did finally, and at too late a day to accomplish anything, report a bill to suspend the coinage after eighteen months, provided there should be no international agreement for bi-metallism meanwhile. Now everybody is on the *qui vive*. Everybody expects action of some sort, and everybody is prepared for it. The Committee on Coinage named by the Speaker appears to us to be not decidedly in favor of a suspension of the coinage, but sufficiently so to bring on a fight, and to give the initiative to those who agree with the views of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. If this is the true color of the Committee, it is all that the opponents of compulsory coinage could properly ask.

The Edmunds bill for the correction of the Mormons, in the form in which it has passed the Senate, saddles the United States Government with the task of administering the property of a religious corporation by means of trustees appointed by the President and in no way responsible to the beneficiaries of the trust. This is proposed, too, by way of punishing all the members of a religious body, because some of them have committed offences already indictable and punishable in the courts. This extraordinary legislation was passed by 38 to 7, and the Massachusetts jurist, Mr. Hoar, had nothing to say against it except that it took away the suffrage from the Mormon women. We trust the House will deal with this remarkable measure as it deserves. In a country in which all forms of religious belief and worship are free, the punishment of whole sects for holding obnoxious opinions by seizing their property is, or ought to be, a monstrous thing. The only American way of dealing with a corporation offensive to the public interests is by winding it up. Government trustees for the management of its affairs would be a monstrous excrescence which ought not to be permitted for any purpose, however good. The Edmunds plan is one of those things which would never be dreamed of as against a considerable body of voters. It is the numerical weakness of the Mormons far more than their polygamy which causes it to be thought of.

Senator Eustis, of Louisiana, has introduced a resolution declaratory of the opinion of Congress that the $10,000,000 of bonds called by Secretary Manning, and to be paid off on the 1st of February, "should be paid in silver dollars." This is, we believe, exactly the number of silver dollars that was recently transferred from New Orleans to Washington by a war vessel in order to save express charges, the weight of the package being 330 tons. Now, in order to carry out Mr. Eustis's notions the *Swatara* ought to be loaded up again with her discharged cargo, and sent around the Atlantic coast and up the various rivers, with a detail of Treasury clerks on board distributing silver dollars to the owners of the called bonds. And for what purpose? So that the same dollars may get into the various express offices for speedy transmission to the nearest custom-houses and internal-revenue offices, and thence back to the Treasury from which they were taken. The cost of transporting silver dollars by express is $3 per 1,000. Consequently the cost of getting the $10,000,000 back again where they belong, and where they would inevitably go, would be $30,000, plus the cost of navigating the *Swatara* and handling the coin. Under the present system, a few checks are drawn by the Treasurer of the United States on the New York Sub-Treasury, and the whole business is done. It is this system that Mr. Eustis and Mr. Beck want to break up, because, in their view, it amounts to paying the bonds in gold, although no gold is actually used. They have the fantastic notion that if silver dollars are paid out, the bondholders will not get gold value, but only silver value, for their bonds, notwithstanding the fact that the Government is all the time redeeming the silver dollars in gold at the custom-house. It is probably due to some misconception upon this point that United States bonds were depressed in the London market when Mr. Eustis's resolution was telegraphed thither. There are plenty of capitalists in this country to pick up any stray lots of bonds dropped on the other side of the water under the influence of such a panic. But it will be something at which Mr. Eustis may always "point with pride," that he caused certain timid people in a distant country to lose a part of their money

---

Apropos of the recent shipment of a small lot of gold, the *Financial Chronicle's* London letter, dated December 26, says: "The announcement of the shipments from New York has come as a surprise here, and it is not yet quite understood. There is some doubt as to its being a bona-fide movement. It is considered here quite possible that the silver question and Stock Exchange speculation may have a good deal to do with the export, and hence has not that importance it would possess were it thought thoroughly a trade matter. We have at present quite enough money lying idle, and know not what to do with any increase in supplies. It would only augment the difficulty experienced in maintaining rates." And the London *Economist* of December 26, speaking on the same subject, says: "It seems hardly possible for the United States to send us much gold at present. Financial circles there are so permeated with apprehension as to the result of the compulsory coinage of silver that they would be certain to take alarm if gold in any quantity were to leave the country. There is, indeed, reason to believe that the present shipments were made with a desire to take advantage of this feeling of apprehension so as to exert a leverage on the stock markets." And in its financial report the *Economist* also says, noting the sudden advance of sterling in New York and the fact of one shipment of gold being arranged: "It seems probable that this movement is due to manipulation, possibly in connection with the Stock Exchange, and it is scarcely likely to attain any magnitude." The artificial character of the advance in sterling, and the lack of necessity for gold shipments in the week ending with December 26, seem to have been understood in London as clearly as by those of our own people

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who know anything about foreign exchange. Unluckily, however, there are very many people who know nothing about foreign exchange, and therefore it is not difficult to produce a temporary scare in the stock market by an occasional manipulation of sterling. It ought none the less to be a difficult matter to secure the coöperation in such manœuvres of any banking firm with a decent reputation or decent connections in foreign countries.

The first formal Republican attack upon the Administration for its appointments to office was made in the Senate by Mr. Hale, of Maine, on Wednesday, and does not appear to have been damaging. His grievance, stripped of its cant, is that in a total of 37 Presidential postmasterships in Maine the President has made three changes, and that in 984 postmasterships not Presidential about 100 changes have been made. Mr. Hale finds no fault with the three Presidential changes, and gives the President credit for not making a "clean sweep." He is not capable of the fairness of giving the full number of the non-Presidential offices, but speaks of them as "a few hundred," and complains that out of the hundred changes made in these, eighty-seven of the new appointees had been recommended by one man, the Chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Maine. This chairman had levied upon all these appointees for his expenses incurred in going to Washington and securing the appointments. There is not the slightest evidence that either the President or the Postmaster-General had any knowledge of the chairman's doings. The Postmaster-General, as Mr. Hale admits, turned the matter over to his assistant, who appointed the men whom the chairman recommended. Mr. Hale calls this a "bargain and sale of offices," talks about it as not merely "muddying the waters" of public life, but "poisoning the fountain," and lifts up a cry for "pure civil-service reform." The only point about the changes which he is able to base his attack upon is the alleged collection of money by the chairman from the new appointees, and of that the Administration had no knowledge and cannot in any way be held responsible for it. When it is considered that there is in the State of Maine scarcely one Republican postmaster who has not been for years a Blaine worker and agent, and that, out of over 1,000 of these, all except about 100 are still in office, Mr. Hale's anxiety about the "poisoning of the fountain" is rather grotesque.

The boycotting of many newly-appointed Democratic postmasters in rural districts by the Republicans of their neighborhood is a curious illustration of the lengths to which party spirit will carry men. Less than a twentieth of the 50,000 postmasters in the United States are paid by salary; the compensation of all the rest depends chiefly upon the business of their offices, and especially upon the number of stamps which they cancel. If the people of a village refuse to deposit their mail matter at the local office, and either hand the letters which they write to a clerk in a railway postal car or send them to the post-office in the next town to be postmarked, they can deprive their own postmaster of nearly all his income, and leave him to do the work of receiving and distributing the mails without getting any adequate pay for his labor. Almost incredible as it seems to residents of a great city that people should take all this trouble to gratify a petty political spite, it is a fact that there are scores, and even hundreds, of little communities scattered throughout the land where this system of boycotting has been introduced by Republicans since Democrats were installed in the post-offices. A recent estimate by the Post-office Department puts the number of such cases at 300, and new instances are constantly reported. The system is most popular in small places where the majority of the people are Republicans, and the excitement which it causes in such villages has scarcely been paralleled since the war. Such performances cast a flood of light upon the condition of society in too many of the rural districts in this country.

The Baltimore Reform League have prepared a memorial to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs in reference to the nomination of Morris A. Thomas as Inspector of Indian Agencies. This man Thomas is charged, among other things, with fraudulent bankruptcy and with an attempt to possess himself of the property of citizens of Maryland by methods little better than theft. One of the affidavits supporting these charges declares that when Thomas failed and went into bankruptcy, he helped himself to securities which had been placed in his hands merely for safe keeping, pretending that he had lost them in his business, but that when he was threatened with criminal prosecution he found them intact and handed them back to the owner. Other charges, of equal turpitude and supported by proofs taken from the court records and the official books of account of the city of Baltimore, were laid before the Secretary of the Interior, and were not answered by Thomas except by a general denial. The question is now an important one whether the Senate will "advise and consent" to such an appointment. There has been much "caucusing" among the Republican majority of that body in order to determine what course they ought to pursue with reference to the President's nominations in general, and more especially with reference to removals made on grounds of offensive partisanship. Those questions can easily be postponed. They are party questions, which are always in order. But the nominations of such characters as Thomas involve moral considerations weighing upon every individual Senator, no matter what party he belongs to. These considerations could not be put aside if the name of Thomas had been sent in by a Republican President. It will be surprising indeed if facts which would not be overlooked in such a case are ignored or lightly regarded in the case of a Democrat. If Thomas is confirmed, he must be confirmed by Republican votes. The responsibility of the Senate is exactly equal to that of the President, and it will not lie in the mouth of any Republican Senator to accuse the President of making any bad nominations to which he (the Senator) has given his advice and consent. To put the matter plainly, the Republican party has the power to prevent any improper appointment whatever in the higher grades of the public service, and it will be held to its responsibility. It will not be allowed to accuse the Democrats of offences to which it is itself a willing accessory.

Massachusetts has now had nearly a year's experience of the merit system in the civil service, and it proves to have worked as well there as everywhere else that it has been tried. The report of the Commissioners presents a mass of evidence of the practicability and advantages of the new methods. The largest number of appointments under the competitive system has been made in the State Bureau of Statistics of Labor and in the Boston Police Department. The chief of the former bureau bears witness that the force thus supplied to him is "very much superior to the one we should have been likely to have secured through the old method of personal application and the endorsement of friends"; that the attendance of these clerks has been more regular than that of any former employees; and that in intelligence, capacity, and attainment, as well as in attendance, the force provided by the new law "reflects the greatest credit upon the civil-service system." The Boston Police Board are no less hearty in their praise, witnessing that, from the certifications for appointment on the patrol force, they have been able to select men well qualified in every way for the service; that, in the matter of promotions, the new system brings to the top of the list those who, by their conduct, efficiency, and educational qualifications, have the highest claims to advancement; and that "it can be said emphatically that the application of civil-service rules to appointments and promotions in this Department has been attended with very satisfactory results." Incidentally, the Commissioners deal another blow at the silly old charge of the spoilsmen that nobody but college graduates would be able to get into office if men were required to show their fitness before being appointed. The whole number of persons who have applied for examination was 1,292, and of these 1,267 had received only a common-school education, the 25 who had been to college representing only 2 per cent. of all! Similar showings have been made in the Federal civil service and in this State, and it will require a very impudent spoilsman hereafter to repeat the ancient "gag" about college graduates in the face of such figures.

The report of the Massachusetts Commissioners is of especial interest in New York just now, because it bears directly upon the scheme which will be again pushed in the new Legislature to make a breach in the competitive system by exempting old soldiers from its operation. A similar attempt was made in the Massachusetts Legislature last year, but it failed, and the Commissioners clearly show from the records that the veterans need no such legislation. The Massachusetts statutes, like those of this State, give old soldiers the preference in appointments and promotions where they stand otherwise on an equality with other competitors. The demagogues have urged that the soldiers were not able to get "book learning" when they were young men because they were fighting for the preservation of the Union, and that consequently they would be unable to pass the examinations, which would be child's play for the college graduates. The records effectually dispose of this charge, for they show that the percentage of veterans who passed the examinations was larger than that of other applicants. The preference in ap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointment which they now enjoy, results in their getting a much larger proportion of places than others who have successfully passed the examinations with them. The report also points out that amendment of the law so as to exempt old soldiers from examination, instead of helping them to secure office, would have had just the opposite effect, since it would have enabled the appointing power to ignore them in cases where under the present rules they must be selected.

In most of the States the address to a new Legislature at the opening of its session is delivered by the new Governor, but in Ohio the retiring Executive also sends in a message a few days before his successor is inaugurated. The custom has much to commend it, especially when the outgoing Governor is a man so full of ideas as Mr. Hoadly, and the message which he sent to the General Assembly on Monday merits more consideration than it is likely to receive from a body politically hostile to him. What he says on the subject of civil-service reform is of general interest. Hardly any State in the Union stands in more urgent need of the application of reform. So thoroughly has the spoils system been accepted that minor officers and guards in the penitentiary are by law required to be appointed upon geographical principles, and the appointments have thus virtually been made by the representatives in the Legislature, or, in counties where they were opposed to the party in power, by the county executive committee of the dominant party. Naturally such a plan has worked very badly, and of 113 guards thus saddled upon the present warden, he has had to get rid of no less than seventeen for the good of the service. Governor Hoadly earnestly urges that the spoils system be abolished so far as the benevolent and penal institutions of the State are concerned. He says with truth that, so far as his own influence has gone, it has been exerted to prevent political reorganizations and changes in these institutions, but very properly holds that the necessary divorce from politics cannot be had without the aid of law. He therefore recommends that some system be adopted which will eliminate political considerations, giving his preference to the plan of competitive examinations adopted in the Federal civil-service law and the New York State law. As he reminds the Legislature, the Republican party of Ohio is pledged by its State platform "to extend this law to all grades of service to which it is applicable," and the public will watch with interest to see how it redeems this pledge.

Ohio is in about the same situation as New York regarding the employment of prisoners. The people two years ago voted to abolish the system of convict contract labor, and, as soon as a few outstanding agreements expire, this method of employing prisoners will come to an end. The financial results of the change in Ohio, as in New York, have been disastrous. The management of the penitentiary drew from the State Treasury only $47,247 more than it paid in during the year ending November 15, 1884, while during the year ending November 15, 1885, the deficit rose to $153,864. The pending question is whether the piece-price plan or the State-account system shall be adopted as the permanent policy, now that contract labor is to be abolished. Governor Hoadly points out, as Superintendent Baker, of New York, has just done, that the great objection to the State-account system is that it requires a costly plant and a large working capital. Besides, work on State account is certain to be a failure if political or partisan considerations control the choice of penitentiary officials, while even if these are eliminated, the plan of working a series of great factories by hired help, without the intelligent supervision of an interested master, has very little promise of financial success. On the other hand, the piece-price plan has the advantage of supplying the State with a market and with the intelligent supervision of interested manufacturers, while so far as it has been tried in Ohio it seems to work well. Governor Hoadly's opinion is that the management of the penitentiary must necessarily be tentative for some time to come; but the whole drift of his discussion of the subject goes to prove that the piece-price plan is the best substitute that can be found for the contract system.

The London *Daily News* announces the death of a lady from eating too much turkey, plum-pudding, and nuts on Christmas Day, and affirms that she was probably the last person who will die in that way, owing to the great change in the eating habits of the population. The practice of expressing joy or kindly feeling, especially at Christmas, by eating immense quantities of one or two things, is a mediæval custom which has lasted longer in England than in other European countries, and was temporarily stimulated or revived, the *Daily News* suggests, by Dickens, whose characters almost all indulge on festive occasions in a tremendous guzzle. The taste for this sort of excess has greatly declined in England. In fact, just now, we believe, it is rather "the thing" among men of the world to have delicate insides, and prefer a chop and a pint of Apollinaris to the most elaborate menu. In this country great feeding has always been rare, the popular taste running rather to nice unwholesome things like pie and doughnuts, than to large quantities of meat or drink. The Southern barbecue is almost the only relic among us of the great gorging of the early Anglo-Saxons.

The hotel, with its varied bill of fare, has, however, done a good deal to stimulate the American appetite, but it takes its pleasure rather in variety than in quantity. An American drummer surrounded by his breakfast or dinner at a "good house" is an alarming sight to those who do not know that he will probably not taste, or do more than taste, half the dishes he orders. What he really seeks in his order is the pleasure of having his whole possible meal "in sight" —something very dear to the plain feeder. This is really the great obstacle in the way of serving a dinner in courses—European fashion —at our tables d'hôte. When the first attempt was made to introduce it in Memorial Hall at Harvard, many of the country boys objected strongly, on the ground that they liked "to see their dinner," and therefore have the pie on the table while they were eating the meat. Then, too, it goes hard with an American to wait for a slower eater than himself before getting to the next dish. There is an excellent New Haven story of a Hartford business man so anxious to get back to work after his midday dinner that he asked his guest "whether he would mind eating his pie in the street."

The announcement that the Queen is going to open Parliament in person is another sign of her strong sympathy with the Conservatives. She opened it last when Disraeli was in power, and never once during Gladstone's last administration. The matter has no political importance, but it cheers up people in society whom the Radicals and the Irish are frightening.

Mr. Bryce, our London correspondent, explains that his reason for leaving his old constituency, the Tower Hamlets, one of the London boroughs now divided into seven, was not, as we suggested, any fear that the Irish vote would be thrown against him, or that he would not be returned easily, but that he desired a less laborious seat, if we may use the term. The demands of a metropolitan constituency on its member are very great both in the way of interviews and correspondence—so great in Mr. Bryce's case, who is one of the most conscientious and indefatigable of letter writers, as seriously to threaten his health. Under these circumstances he was glad to accept a very warm invitation from the Aberdeenshire Liberals, the more so as, being a Scotchman, he likes to represent a Scotch constituency.

A recent number of the *Révolté*, a French Anarchist paper, has an elaborate article calling for the destruction of all registries of births and baptisms as soon as "the social war breaks out," with the view of getting rid of the odious custom of giving people fixed and indelible names before their characters are sufficiently developed to show what names suit them. Our names, the writer says, ought to be in some sort a description of us, so that on hearing a person's name, you would get an idea at once of the kind of person he was They ought to change, too, as we go on in life, according to age, place, and circumstances. A man ought to have one name in his youth, another in middle life, and another in old age, and he ought to be able to change it as best suits "the mobility of his disposition" and changes in his manner of life. One man may find one name sufficient for his whole life, another may need as many names as he has shirts. The essential thing is that a man should be allowed to change his name when he pleases, and should not have any name, whether baptismal or surname, fastened on him by law, and no one should have more than one name. The writer points out that in family and professional and workshop intercourse, nobody has more than one name, and that generally a descriptive nickname, and this is therefore the natural revolutionary mode of distinguishing people. The way in which all this has been anticipated or illustrated in our local politics is known to all our readers. When we say Mike, Jake, Barney, Sol, or Steve, everybody knows who is meant, and what kind of man he is, far better than if his baptismal name and family name were set out in full.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, January 6, to TUESDAY, January 12, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

SPEAKER CARLISLE on Thursday announced the House Committees. The Chairmen are as follows: Turner, of Georgia—Elections. Randall, of Pennsylvania—Appropriations. Morrison, of Illinois—Ways and Means. Herbert, of Alabama—Naval Affairs. Bragg, of Wisconsin—Military Affairs. Belmont, of New York—Foreign Affairs. Curtin, of Pennsylvania—Banking and Currency. Bland, of Missouri—Coinage, Weights, and Measures. Willis, of Kentucky—Rivers and Harbors. O'Neil, of Missouri—Labor. Mitchell, of Connecticut—Patents. Throckmorton, of Texas—Pacific Railways. Reagan, of Texas—Commerce. Cobb, of Indiana—Public Lands. Tucker, of Virginia—Judiciary. Wellborn, of Texas—Indian Affairs. Blount, of Georgia—Post-offices and Post-roads. Springer, of Illinois—Claims. Spriggs, of New York—Accounts. Matson, of Indiana—Invalid Pensions. Muller, of New York—Militia. Geddes, of Ohio—War Claims. King, of Louisiana—Mississippi River. Aiken, of South Carolina—Education. Eldridge, of Michigan—Pensions. Halsell, of Kentucky—Private Land Claims. Barbour, of Virginia—District of Columbia. Cox, of North Carolina—Reform in Civil Service. Dunn, of Arkansas—American Shipbuilding.

It is believed that the Coinage Committee on the issue between monometallism and bimetallism is to be classed as a silver committee. But it will be against an indefinite continuance of the coinage of the 412½-grain silver dollar under the Bland act by about 7 to 6. It will be in favor of some provision which will continue the use of silver in the currency without continuing the coinage of the Bland dollar. The Committee, however, would be decidedly opposed to the demonetization of silver. The Ways and Means Committee represents every shade of opinion upon the tariff, and every proposition that has thus far been submitted on the tariff question will find an exponent upon this Committee. It is understood that some kind of a tariff bill will be prepared at an early day. The Banking and Currency Committee is composed in about equal proportions of the friends and opponents of the national banking system. Upon the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the advocates and the opponents of large appropriations alike find representation. On the Committee on Indian Affairs pains were taken to give representation to the advocates of the various plans for the settlement of the Indian problem. Mr. Cox, of North Carolina, the Chairman of the Civil-Service Reform Committee, is reported as saying that he is a thorough believer in the merit system, but that the Republicans who were in office before the system was established should be turned out, and be placed on the same footing with other candidates for office. He thinks that there is more dissatisfaction with the rules of the Commission than with the law.

The Chair laid before the United States Senate on Wednesday a letter from the Postmaster-General complying with the call of a recent Senate resolution in respect to the appointment of postmasters in Maine, alleged to have been procured through the influence of S. S. Brown, Chairman of the Democratic Committee of that State. The communication having been read, Mr. Hale said that before it went to the country he desired to say a few words with regard to it. It was every day becoming the belief of the people, he said, that the civil service of the Government should not be the result of party service. Above all, the country desired that we should have a pure civil service. There should be no taint of bargain and sale about it. The Republicans had expected to go out. The Administration had taken a conservative course, and the President, though pressed to make a general sweep of the postmasters in Maine, had declined. But the people of many places had waked up one morning in Maine, and found that persons had been appointed whom nobody wanted and nobody recommended. In one case it was found that the Chairman of the Democratic Committee, Mr. S. S. Brown, had given up his law practice, closed his office, and had come to Washington to attend to the distribution of patronage under the civil-service system. Mr. Hale acquitted the Postmaster General of any endorsement of Mr. Brown. Brown had come to Washington endorsed by the Democratic party, or its committees. The Postmaster-General had turned these matters of appointments over to his assistant, who relied on Mr. Brown. But the Postmaster-General had not made complete answer to the resolution of the Senate. He had not stated whether the wishes of the people had been respected in the new appointments—which was the *summum bonum* of the inquiry. No explanation had been made of the infamous system on which the proceedings complained of had been based. Senators Vest and Voorhees replied. The debate ended with a reference of the report to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, where it will probably stay.

Senator Vance, who has introduced a bill to repeal the Civil-Service Act, says that he is in earnest and will speak in support of it; that he does not expect many votes, because those who are against the law have not the courage of their convictions, but that he is convinced from private conversations that a majority of the Senate would be glad to have the law repealed.

Senator Wilson, of Iowa, on Friday reported favorably from the Committee on Post-offices and Post-roads the bill introduced by him to prohibit the mailing of newspapers and other publications containing lottery advertisements.

Senator Eustis, of Louisiana, on Friday introduced a resolution providing for the payment in silver dollars of the $10,000,000 bonds embraced in Mr. Manning's recent call.

The reports that Secretary Manning contemplates paying in silver any of the bonds recently called in are unfounded.

The Senate confirmed the nominations of the three Civil-Service Commissioners on Monday. When the nomination of Mr. Eaton came up Senator Logan made the point that Mr. Eaton was a "Mugwump," and that the spirit of the Civil Service Law required that one of the Commissioners be a Republican. Senators Evarts, Hoar, and one or two others vouched for his Republicanism. There are said to have been fourteen votes cast against him, one-half of which were those of Republicans. Mr. Eaton wants to resign his office on February 1.

Mr. Frye (Rep., Me.) introduced a bill on Monday in the Senate for the relief of the American merchant marine. It repeals the statutes requiring the payment of fees for marine documents, certificates of inspection, etc., and provides that the collectors whose duty it is to furnish these papers shall be paid by the United States. Masters of coastwise vessels are authorized to employ a shipping commissioner to ship crews. The liability limitation clause of the last Shipping Act is extended to vessels in interior waters and to those engaged in the coastwise trade.

The House on Tuesday adopted a resolution, calling upon the Postmaster-General for information as to the advisability of changing the existing method of compensating railways for the transportation of the mails. Some members of the Post-office Committee are of opinion that the present plan is too expensive, and that a system can be devised which, while more economical, would not interfere with the expedition of the mails. The Hoar Presidential Succession Bill was favorably reported in the House on that day.

Oliver P. Burger, who has been a clerk in the Post-office Department at Washington since September, has been dismissed for circulating postal cards saying that it was easy to get into the Government service under the civil-service rules, and offering to give the necessary information how to do it to those who were willing to pay for it.

The Ohio legislative caucus on Thursday night renominated John Sherman for United States Senator. The Democrats have abandoned their hope of defeating his election. The Mississippi Democratic caucus has renominated the two present Senators, George and Walthall.

The Democrats of the Ohio Legislature on Monday night nominated Allen G. Thurman for United States Senator, giving him 38 votes to 28 for Governor Hoadly.

In the Ohio House of Representatives on Tuesday the nine Democratic members from Hamilton County were unseated and nine Republicans put in their places. This action was ample assurance of the reëlection of Senator Sherman, giving him twenty-one majority on joint ballot. Both houses voted for Senator separately on Tuesday, Mr. Sherman receiving sixty-seven in the lower house and seventeen in the Senate, and Mr. Thurman forty-one in the House and twenty in the Senate.

The new rules and amendments to rules proposed by Speaker Husted to the New York Assembly on Wednesday create three new committees—one on appropriations, one on excise, and one on revision of bills. After considerable discussion the rules of 1885 were adopted, and the Speaker was empowered to appoint the three new committees, their powers and duties to be hereafter defined.

In the Assembly on Wednesday a bill was introduced incorporating the Grant Monument Association.

The threatened strike of engineers on the elevated railroads of this city was settled on Thursday by a compromise. The agreement signed concedes all that the men asked for in the original bill of grievances, except that nine hours will constitute a day's work instead of eight, and that the following clause, No. 9, is stricken out: "That no engineer shall be censured for failing to make time in foggy weather, thereby endangering lives of people and destruction of property, as has been done in the past."

Hundreds of negroes are leaving the Carolinas, Georgia, and Alabama for the West, owing to high rents, bad crops, and a defective tenant system.

A blizzard accompanied with intense cold and snow prevailed from Friday to Monday from Dakota to the Gulf and throughout the Eastern States. Railroad traffic was generally interrupted.

The widow of Gen. George G. Meade died in Philadelphia on Thursday.

Ex-Governor Benjamin Conley, of Georgia, died suddenly in Atlanta on Sunday in his seventy-first year. He was a Republican, and on Governor Bullock's flight in 1872 succeeded him by virtue of his office as President of the Senate. He was soon ousted by the Democrats, who ordered a special election.

FOREIGN.

Robert Giffen, LL. D., proposes in the London *Statist* a scheme which would enable home rule to be granted to Ireland without exposing the property of landlords to plunder, and without imposing any serious burden on the Imperial Exchequer. The plan is for the Imperial Government first to buy out every landlord in Ireland, giving him consols at par equal in nominal amount to twenty years' purchase of the present judicial rents; second, to give the land free to the present occupiers, subject only to a rent charge of one-half or two-thirds of the present judicial rent, payable to the new local authorities in Ireland; and, third, to relieve the Imperial Exchequer of all payments

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now made out of it in connection with the local government of Ireland. The plan is, in fact, to throw the cost of the local government in Ireland upon Irish resources exclusively, and to give the Irish people the rent of the country for the purpose of conducting it. Taking the rent of Ireland as settled judicially at about £8,000,000, the consols at par to be given in exchange at twenty years' purchase would be £160,000,000, involving an annual charge of £4,800,000 upon the Imperial Exchequer. At present the Government expends annually upon Ireland for the local government close upon £4,000,000, exclusive altogether of the outlay for the army of occupation, for the collection of revenue, and other imperial matters which would still remain imperial. The position as regards Irish tenants would be, that where they now pay £8,000,000, they would have to pay only from £4,000,000 to £5,500,000.

Earl Grey, writing to the London *Times*, deprecates the concession of local government to Ireland, as he believes that such power would be made the means of oppressing all who dissent from the doctrines of the National League. The improvement of the condition of the people of Ireland, he says, must emanate from themselves; it must be brought about by provident habits and greater industry. It is the imperative duty of the Government to suppress outrages and violations of law in Ireland, and until that is accomplished all concessions to the Irish people will merely serve, like sweets to children, to stop their crying.

John Morley, Radical member for Newcastle-on-Tyne, made an important speech on Thursday night, which is the first distinctive Radical utterance on Irish home rule. He said: "I have not come to develop a scheme of government for Ireland. That is for our leader. Whatever the *Times* may say, and whatever his assailants, secret and open, may say, I believe there is no man in this realm who is competent to take this task in hand except the statesman who has devoted the best part of his life to the amelioration of the condition of Ireland, and whose great abilities and human sympathy will be found the only means capable of solving the great Irish question. All that I would urge upon you is not to be misled by any idea that we are in a mere Parliamentary crisis. We are in a great national crisis." In conclusion he said: "If I am in favor of finding new ways of dealing with the Irish problem, of leaving the old rut, and of approaching that problem boldly, calling upon our statesmen to give some constructive solution of our difficulties, it is because I am persuaded that in that direction it is you must look for the strengthening of the empire; that in any other direction you will only weaken the empire, tie your own hands, and make yourself powerless for carrying out those great tasks which have been confided to this nation."

A number of unofficial Liberal members of Parliament have been making overtures to the Parnellites for the coöperation of the latter in raising a question as to home rule during the debate on the address in reply to the Queen's speech. Mr. Parnell declines to reply to Liberal overtures unless they are accompanied by an express agreement to grant Ireland home rule. The Parnellites will await the Government's proposals.

A conference of Parnellites in Dublin on Monday resolved to continue with an unalterable determination their struggle to secure the rights of Ireland. The consideration of the most important questions was postponed until the arrival of Mr. Parnell. Mr. Gladstone held a reception at Carlton Terrace on Monday evening. Earl Granville, Sir William V. Harcourt, Lord Hartington, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Chamberlain were conspicuous by their absence.

Parliament opened on Tuesday. Large crowds had congregated in the vicinity of Parliament House, and when Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Gladstone arrived they were loudly cheered. The Right Hon. Arthur Wellesley Peel, who is a Liberal, was reëlected Speaker of the House of Commons without opposition.

The Government does not intend to prevent Mr. Charles Bradlaugh from sitting in the House of Commons as Member for Northampton.

The Queen's speech will not be submitted to Parliament until next week. It has been delayed in order that members who are at a distance from London may have time to make arrangements to be in their places if a debate should arise.

There is great distress among the poorer classes in Scotland. A meeting of 5,000 unemployed persons was held in Glasgow on Friday, and it was resolved to make an appeal to the wealthier classes. No Socialistic remarks were indulged in.

The proposed American Exhibition in London has been postponed for one year—from May, 1886, to May, 1887. It was discovered that the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, in which Englishmen take great pride and which is to be held this year, would probably prove disastrous to the proposed American show.

Ten thousand Burmese rebels are scouring the country within a radius of twenty miles of Mandalay and threaten to attack the town. Fears of an émeute are felt, owing to the great reduction of the British force at Mandalay by the withdrawal of troops for the expedition to Bhamo. Prince Alompra is at the head of the rebel force and claims to be king.

The work of widening the Suez Canal is delayed, owing to the refusal of the Egyptian Government to sanction a modification of the treaty so as to allow the interest on the proposed loan of £8,000,000 to be paid out of the loan itself, instead of from the receipts of the canal, as stipulated by the treaty.

The French Government will, at the request of the Panama Canal Company, send M. Rousseau, a trustworthy engineer, to inspect and report on the condition and prospects of the Panama Canal. If the report of M. Rousseau is favorable, a loan will be granted the company to push the work to completion. If it is adverse, the enterprise will be allowed to collapse, and the Government will assume the responsibility.

A new French Cabinet was announced on Thursday, but is not received with enthusiasm, though Clémenceau and Rochefort advocate giving it a fair trial. It is as follows: M. de Freycinet, President of the Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs; M. Sarrien, Minister of the Interior; M. Sadi-Carnot, Minister of Finance; M. Goblet, Minister of Public Instruction; M. Demole, Minister of Justice; M. Develle, Minister of Agriculture; General Boulanger, Minister of War; M. Aube, Minister of Marine and the Colonies; M. Baïhaut, Minister of Public Works; M. Granet, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs; M. Lockroy, Minister of Commerce. Lockroy and Granet represent the Radical element.

Count Alfred de Falloux is dead at the age of seventy-five. He has been prominent in France as a writer and politician. He was a Legitimist, but was one of the first after the flight of Louis Philippe in 1848 to recognize the new republican form of government. He was one of the Deputies who organized the resistance to the insurgents. On the election of Louis Napoleon to the Presidency he was made Minister of Public Instruction. In 1872, at Versailles, he proposed to demand of the Comte de Chambord the recognition of the tricolor and the acceptance of the Comte de Paris in default of the heir direct. This speech roused press discussion and party anger, until the Count found that the easiest way out was to declare himself "a proved Legitimist." His writings dealt with religion, politics, and agriculture.

During the latter part of December rebels destroyed the Catholic mission-houses at Ughean, Anam, and killed a French missionary and 500 native Christians. A column of French troops was sent in pursuit of the rebels. It overtook and routed them and captured their arms and ammunition.

The Powers have summoned Servia, Bulgaria, and Greece to disarm, promising them that Turkey shall follow their example. Servia has resolved not to make peace with Bulgaria until the question regarding the disposition of Eastern Rumelia by the Powers has been solved in a manner which will satisfy the wishes of the Servian Government.

Prince Alexander and the Porte have come to an understanding on the following conditions: That the union of the Bulgarians be recognized by the Porte; that the Bulgarian army be at the disposal of Turkey in the event of war with Greece or Servia; that tribute be paid regularly to the Porte; that the customs rights of the Porte be maintained, and that Prince Alexander go to Constantinople to be invested with the Governorship of Eastern Rumelia.

The Greek Government has made overtures to the Government of Montenegro looking to an alliance against the Porte. The King of Greece will leave his capital soon for the Thessalian frontier to inspect the army. It is supposed that this will be the prelude to the beginning of hostilities. Bismarck has warned Greece against war.

The financial difficulties of the Turkish Government are increasing. The soldiers are clamoring for their pay. It is proposed to issue paper money. The Military Council will instruct the commander on the Greek frontier to attack the Greeks if they make any hostile movement.

Emperor William has signed the Spirits Monopoly Bill and submitted it to the Bundesrath. The bill proposes to compensate those deprived of a livelihood through its operation on the basis of a two years' income to each person ten years in the trade. The traffic will be controlled by a monopoly ministry, which will appoint agents to do the wholesale vending of the refined spirits, the Federal States appointing the retailers.

Minister Pendleton has induced the German Government to rescind the order for the expulsion of German-Americans from the island of Foehr.

No news of the reported seizure of the Samoan Islands by the war ship *Albatross* has been received by the German Government. Germany adheres to the neutrality agreement with England respecting Samoa. The State Department at Washington has received no advices regarding the alleged seizure. The independence of Samoa has been guaranteed by a treaty between the United States, Germany, and England. It is asserted that Germany is merely settling her differences with the reigning King of Samoa, and when she has succeeded will restore neutrality.

Contrary to alarmist reports, the Pope is in excellent health.

A party of seventy Spanish rebels, including forty belonging to the garrison, seized Fort St. Julian, in Carthagena, on Monday, and wounded the Military Governor. Troops hastened to the scene of the disturbance, and the rebels fled to a small vessel in waiting in the harbor. They shouted for Zorilla and the republic. A man-of-war has gone in pursuit of them, and Carthagena has been declared in a state of siege. Several arrests were made.

The Belgian Senate has adopted a bill providing that newspaper telegrams and other news bearing editors' notices forbidding reproduction must not be reproduced without credit.

A fight has taken place between a body of Russian troops and a tribe who were crossing the Persian frontier to winter in Russian territory. The Persian Government is said to fear a Russian invasion of Khorassan.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MR. BAYARD AND THE FISHERY QUESTION.

NOTHING could be more flagitious and unwarranted than the recent attacks, led by a prominent Democrat in Massachusetts, on Secretary Bayard for his course in relation to the pending fishery question; and their virulence naturally suggests a suspicion of an intent to forestall anything like a calm discussion of the merits of the case by appealing to and awakening popular prejudices. But what are the facts in the case?

The fishing clauses of the Washington Treaty of 1871 having been abrogated on the 1st of July last by the action of Congress, the Treaty of 1818 (between the United States and Great Britain), determining the rights and privileges of citizens of the United States engaged in fishing in British American waters, again comes in force. In this treaty the United States renounced any right to fish "within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, and harbors of his Britannic Majesty's dominions in North America." The interpretation of this limitation—certainly on the part of English diplomatists—has always been "that the three miles meant miles to be measured from the headlands or extreme points of land at the entrance of bays or indents of the coast," and, therefore, that American fishermen had no right to enter such bays or indents to take fish, even if the fishing were done at a distance of more than three miles from the shore. It is also to be here noted that, in agreeing to such renunciation of fishing rights, the United States relinquished to Great Britain nothing more than it claims for itself — our admiralty jurisdiction by act of Congress extending within a marine league from our shores, while in 1806 our Government thought it not unreasonable that they should have exclusive jurisdiction "within the chambers formed by headlands, or anywhere at sea within the distance of four leagues; or from a right line from one headland to another" (see Madison's letter to Monroe and Pinckney, May 17, 1806). Judge Story, in his Commentaries, also thought that the United States had a right to claim maritime jurisdiction for fiscal and defensive purposes over waters on our coasts, even though included within lines stretching from quite distant headlands, as from Cape Ann to Cape Cod, and from Nantucket to Montauk Point, etc.

But although the United States has by its own legislation clearly acquiesced in the English interpretation of the Treaty of 1818, its fishermen—especially those engaged in the cod fishery off Newfoundland—never have; and ever since the ratification of this Treaty of 1818 the attempt on the part of British colonial authorities to enforce it has led to numberless collisions between our fishing vessels and the British coast-guard cruisers, with arrests and seizures of property, prolonged litigation and diplomatic correspondence; and in more than one instance the two countries, by reason of these disputes, have been led almost to the verge of war. Now it was under these circumstances that Congress abrogated the Treaty of 1871, and, with a carelessness in respect to detail that is not a little singular, fixed upon the 18th of July, 1885, in the midst of the fishery season, as the day on which the abrogation should take effect, and the arrangement for the season's fishing entered into in the spring by the American fleet be summarily broken up. It is to be borne in mind that the privileges granted to the Americans by the treaty covered not only the right of fishing along the shores and within the bays and headlands of the British colonies, but also the right to land for the purpose of drying and curing fish, for mending and drying nets, for the purchase of ice, bait, wood, and other ship's stores, and for selling and disposing of their "catch" if they found it profitable so to do—as is the case in respect to the catch of cod below a certain size. The result of this would have been that if the Canadian and Newfoundland authorities had insisted upon their rights, and had summarily compelled the American fishermen to desist from fishing in British colonial waters after the first of July, the business of the American fleet would have been mainly broken up, large losses would have been entailed upon its owners, and a feeling of bitterness engendered which it was clearly the intent of both Governments to avert.

That such a condition of affairs was imminent is shown by the circumstance that during the last winter a bill was introduced into the Canadian Parliament providing for two armed cruisers to protect the Dominion fisheries from encroachment consequent upon the abrogation of the treaty. Accordingly, early during the last year, at the promptings mainly (it is understood) of the authorities of Newfoundland, who had no desire to have their shores and waters made the scene of turmoil and possible conflict, a proposition was made to the Administration by the British Government, through its Minister at Washington, that the fishing ventures of the American fishermen in British colonial waters, commenced prior to the 1st of July, 1885, should be allowed to continue until the end of the fishing season the same as if the treaty had not been abrogated; on condition that the President of the United States would call the attention of Congress to the matter at its next session, and recommend the authorization of a commission on the part of the United States and Great Britain to consider the subject, and if possible settle the questions at issue in an amicable manner. It is for promptly acceding to this friendly proposition, with the sanction of the Executive, that Mr. Bayard is now abused and accused of having transcended his authority. The last charge rests upon the circumstance that in the memoranda exchanged between the two Governments it was understood, but not stipulated, that the same immunity accorded by Great Britain to the citizens of the United States engaged in fishing in British-American waters, should be extended to British vessels and subjects engaged in fishing in the waters of the United States; and this, it is claimed, Mr. Bayard had no right to do. But the shallowness of the pretence here set up becomes apparent when it is understood that if there is any fishing by British subjects within American waters—*i. e.*, within three miles of the shore—it is probably accidental and exceptional rather than intentional.

In short, the secret of this whole business—the abrogation of the treaty in the first instance, and the opposition to any attempt to settle any pending difficulties relating to the fisheries in a rational manner by another treaty—grows out of a desire to increase the price of fish food to the great mass of the American people by imposing high protective duties on the same. And the parties to this project start with the assumption that the British colonial authorities have not the same right to control their own local waters which this country claims and exercises in respect to its own waters, and scout the very idea that anything like a reciprocity of interest is involved in the controversy. As we seem to learn little in respect to any of the great questions of the day except through the hard school of experience, it would on some accounts appear to be desirable that no attempt should be made at present to renew the fishery treaty, in which case the American "Bank" fishermen would probably, in about six months, be calling for the protection of armed vessels, and the country, in addition to its present business embarrassments, would have the prospect of more or less serious complications with Great Britain to think about.

OUR FOREIGN LEGATIONS.

THE Troy *Times*, of which our late Minister to Vienna, Mr. Francis, is the editor, has a long article in answer to the *Nation's* advocacy of the abolition of our foreign legations. He pleads, on behalf of the legations, first "the wisdom of the fathers" who established them, forgetting that the fathers knew nothing about the electric telegraph and the compound marine steam engine. He next pleads that consuls cannot communicate with foreign governments at all, and we cannot by any legislation empower them to do so. This is true, but they can communicate with their own Government in about two hours from any part of the world, and their own Government can communicate with any other in about the same time, and settle claims for "damages suffered, illegal arrests," and so on, when serious, by special envoy. Mr. Francis—for we may presume it is he—further says that

> "From his friendly relation with colleagues of the diplomatic corps, the minister may learn essential facts respecting the movements and intentions of other governments oftentimes bearing upon important interests of his own country and upon affairs respecting the common interests of nations. The duties of the diplomatic officer are of grave character, and involve serious responsibilities pertaining to the intercourse and good understanding of nations."

A minister undoubtedly "may" learn such things, but, as a matter of fact, the American minister does not. We believe there has not been a case since the close of the war in which our ministers have sent home any news of importance to us about "the movements or intentions of foreign governments" which might not have been learned from the newspapers, except during Blaine's Chilian trouble, which he got up himself. If Mr. Francis knows of any other case, let him produce it. He further says:

> "It is not true that because our ministers, as a rule, do not speak several languages, and because the law requires them to appear at diplomatic assemblies in plain dress in contrast with the showy uniforms of colleagues, they are therefore subjected to the pain of ridicule and shame of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humiliation. The English language is spoken everywhere, and by the larger proportion of fairly educated persons abroad; it is spoken at the foreign offices with which ministers are in communication; it is largely understood and spoken in diplomatic and court societies. Our Government requires its ministers to write in English all notes addressed to foreign offices. Our ministers, though not generally skilled linguists, have no difficulty in making themselves understood, nor of understanding others with whom they have to deal in diplomatic intercourse."

Our charge was not that our ministers "do not speak several languages," but that, except in England, they rarely speak the language of the country to which they are accredited. At this moment we happen to have a minister in Paris who speaks French fluently, and have had of late several in Berlin who spoke German, but this state of things is rare. In the first year of the war, the American Legation at Paris, where the Confederate envoys were intriguing sharply, had not a single person who could speak French or read the newspapers except a hired interpreter, who, it was currently reported, sold Mr. Dayton's conversations with the Minister of Foreign Affairs to Slidell. Moreover, the English language is *not* "spoken everywhere," or "by the larger proportion of fairly educated persons" in any country. And our ministers *have* difficulty in making themselves understood—difficulty that in most cases amounts to impossibility. Mr. Francis must not suppose that his having filled a diplomatic post himself qualifies him to give flat denials in matters of this sort, of which every American who has visited a foreign capital is more or less cognizant. The truth is, that there is generally no worse authority on the position of the American minister abroad than the good soul who fills the place, and feels all the glory of it. Of what people are saying around him he generally knows nothing, and his brother diplomats are of course polite by profession, and take care of his self-love much better than he can do it himself. If he could get admitted sometimes to their inner gossip about him and his ways, it would make him a much better authority on the value of American diplomatic service than he is now.

Of course the explanation of all this is very simple. Qualifications for a particular place are hardly ever considered in filling our legations abroad. The considerations which govern the appointments are almost always considerations of home politics. One man gets this because he gave a good contribution to the campaign fund; another gets that because he stumped or wrote vigorously during the canvass, or because he lost his seat in Congress, and "hung round" a good deal. Why should a process of selection which has not the smallest relation to the work to be done produce any better results than we have described? Why should a rattling country editor, or rousing stump orator, or a wealthy business man necessarily make a good diplom tic officer? There is no reason in the world. If our diplomatic service, filled as it is, served its ostensible purpose fully, it would shake one's confidence in the principle of cause and effect. Everybody knows that the real reason why it is kept up is to furnish party rewards to politicians of some prominence, for whom nothing sufficiently dignified can be found at home. There is no real use for it. All the watching we need done can be done by consuls; any slight difficulties can be settled by telegraphic correspondence; any serious one by special envoys, who would be sure to be selected, and always are selected, with reference to their qualifications for the work to be done.

There is no day in the year, probably, under the present system, in which an American minister is not, in some quarter of the world, discrediting his country in the eyes of foreigners by his ignorance or bad manners. At this moment our Minister to Japan is a standing scandal. We have sent there a Texan cowboy sort of man, who thinks it fine and "American" to be brutal and insolent to his colleagues and the natives, who are themselves among the most polite and ceremonious people in the world, and who, far from knowing any language but his own, probably is rather proud of the fact that he does not. The social gossip of every city in Europe except London is full of funny stories and traditions of the queer people who come over to represent the United States. The following bit of news just received is a specimen of the materials for ridicule and amusement which American ministers are constantly furnishing their colleagues, in some capital or other:

"One of our naval officers on the west coast of South America writes home that Mr. Buck, the new Minister to Peru, has been guilty of appearing at an official dinner in a business suit. The dinner was given in his honor, and he was the only one of the guests who did not appear in evening dress. It was afterward disclosed that Mr. Buck did not have such a thing in his wardrobe, and the officer writes that he and other of the Minister's friends have since succeeded in finding one for him."

This gossip is now and then silenced for a while by the appearance on the scene of a thoroughly accomplished American, who knows how to fill his place; and occasionally such a man, like the late Mr. Marsh in Italy, is allowed to remain long enough at his post to efface all memories of any other kind. But these cases are rare. A new Administration comes in, and, presto! the courtier, scholar, soldier, gives place to some child of nature, fresh from the woods and bent on showing the effete societies of Europe how freemen ought to behave.

A STUDY OF "RING RULE."

THE closing number of the third series of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science has for its subject "The City of Washington: Its Origin and Administration." About half of the *brochure* is devoted to a study of the late Territorial Government (in which Alexander R. Shepherd held supreme dominion), and of its historical sequel, the triumvirate commission now charged with the administration of the city.

As the study is intended by its author, Mr. John Addison Porter, to be "suggestive rather than exhaustive," it might disarm criticism for its sketchiness if, unhappily, from the fault of his method, the writer had not made the latter half of his treatise almost as misleading for what it contains as for what it omits. In a prefatory note Mr. Porter explains that he has derived no special knowledge of his subject from any one of the numerous volumes on Washington. "In fact," he adds, "material for the study was chiefly obtained from local newspapers," the files of which at the Capitol are described as "very complete and of unusual interest to the student of American history and politics." In thus uncovering his method of research, Mr. Porter discloses at once the secret of the inaccuracy and insufficiency which we find in the whole treatment of what he calls "the reign of the Board of Public Works" in Washington while the star of Mr. Shepherd was in its brief and baleful ascendency. It is matter of notoriety that the "local newspapers" of Washington during that epoch, with a few transient exceptions, were conducted in the interest of the so-called "Washington Ring." So completely were these organs won over to the thick-and-thin support of the Board that its adversaries in Washington were at last compelled to seek the hospitality of journals in Baltimore and New York for the publication of their grievances. It is no matter of surprise, therefore, that in drawing his "material" from such partial authorities Mr. Porter has inadvertently fallen into anachronisms and errors of statement which would have been detected at once if he had made more careful reference to official public documents, equally accessible at the Capitol with the files of the "local newspapers."

We can notice only a few of the numerous inaccuracies in this part of the Study. Referring to the prosecution which in the year 1872 conducted the first inquisition into the methods of the Washington Board of Public Works, Mr. Porter says that it "failed to substantiate any one of the many counts on which it had boasted that it would secure the conviction of the Board." We do not know what the prosecution "boasted," but we do know that, in the unanimous judgment of the Congressional Committee charged with the investigation of that year, at least one of the "counts" *was* "substantiated"—the count directed against the unexampled profligacy of the Board in dispensing advertising and printing patronage to the "local newspapers." On this "count" the Board was "convicted," and, besides, its members were censured for not being "sufficiently mindful of the small extent of their jurisdiction," for not duly considering "the slender constituency upon which all the public burdens were to rest," and finally (what was really the gravamen of nearly all the counts filed by the prosecution) for not taking sufficient care "to have rigid economy prevail in every department." The Board, it is true, was continued in office, but with a public reprimand which to men of sensitive public virtue would have sounded rather like a rebuke than the "moral victory" which Mr. Porter describes.

After reciting how the Board signalized their "victory" by the display of "despotic powers"; how they built miles upon miles of sidewalks, carriage pavements, country roads, sewers, water mains, gas mains, etc.; how they laid a dozen different kinds of wood pavements, and how they planted no less than 25,000 shade trees—and all this in the short space of eighteen months—Mr. Porter concludes the glowing record with the still more glowing assertion: "In short, they *created* Washington as it is known to-day."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The slightest familiarity with the municipal history of Washington during the last eleven years would have protected the writer from risking such a stroke of rhetoric in a grave historical paper. What the Board of Public Works "created" for Washington, "as it is known to-day," can be chiefly found in an enormous public debt, piled up mountain high, beyond all precedent in even American municipal administration, and this, too, largely for "street improvements" which because of their utter worthlessness it has been found necessary to make over again under the present methodical and honest Government. We may instance the single matter of the fifty-odd miles of wood pavements. The first cost of these pavements was more than $4,000,000, a debt on which Washington is still paying interest, though the abominations of desolation have at last been entirely replaced by new pavements of good construction—the replacement within six years alone, from 1878 to 1884, having absorbed nearly a million and a half dollars ($1,420,250). Mr. Porter is equally at fault in his cosmogony of Washington when, after enumerating the sewerage system of the city among the "creations" of the Board, he pronounces it "adequate and complete." If he had turned to the annual report of the Commissioners of the District for 1884, he would have found that the sewers bequeathed to the present Government by the Shepherd Board were constructed on an erroneous theory of surface rainfall; that the largest of them was choked with backwater at every heavy shower; that at many points they soon fell in because of careless construction; that their bottoms soon wore out because laid with rotten bricks; and that even the roots of the trees sometimes struck through their tops as through common mould (Report for 1884, p. 176).

Mr. Porter says that at the beginning of the investigation in 1874 the Board "assumed a shrewd attitude," and professed themselves "entirely willing that the examination should be made." What attitude the Board may have shrewdly assumed in the "local newspapers" we know not. But it is a matter of public record that Governor Shepherd, in his own name, and in the name of his associates, formally and vehemently protested in a memorial to Congress against what he called "further needless and fruitless investigations." The first investigation was enough for him, and he thought it ought to be enough for everybody else. Mr. Porter says that up to the very end of the inquiry "it was a neck-and-neck race" whether the Shepherd Board or its opponents should win their case. On the contrary, the members of the Joint Congressional Committee made no scruple, toward the end of the scrutiny, in betraying their righteous impatience at some of the Board's irresponsible methods—an impatience which found expression in a unanimous report favoring the summary extirpation of the whole Territorial Government root and branch.

Mr. Porter infers the beneficence of "Ring Rule" in Washington from the fact that real-estate "operations" rose in the city from $4,000,000 in 1870 to $12,000,000 in 1873, without pausing to consider how large a part of this increase resulted from the "confiscations" of the Board, which forced property out of the hands of its owners into the maw of speculators. He praises the "foresight" of Mr. Shepherd "in narrowing many of the ways," as if that plan had not been already in partial execution; his "foresight" in "transforming the sewerage system" of the city, as if he had not left it so deformed that the real transformation came after him; and his "foresight" in adopting "concrete for the roads instead of Belgian pavements," as if, in his original and "comprehensive plan" of street improvements, formulated in 1871, Mr. Shepherd had not virtually excluded both, by holding that "the value of property in the District of Columbia would not warrant the general introduction of wood or other expensive pavements," or that, "if used at all, they should be confined to a few of the principal avenues." This was the "foresight" which presaged the construction, within less than three years afterward, of more than fifty miles of worse than worthless wood pavements, some of them stretching into the waste and uninhabited parts of the city, and costing, altogether, as has been already said, more than $4,000,000! Such was the "foresight" of the man whom Mr. Porter holds up to our admiration as a "master mind," many of whose plans showed "a positive genius for municipal administration." True, a committee of Congress, composed of enlightened Republicans and Democrats, after carefully scrutinizing his "municipal administration," unanimously reported that, as a cure for the abuses which had become organic in the Territorial Government, no remedy would suffice "short of its abolition." True, when President Grant, soon after the close of the inquest, nominated this "master mind" as one of the Commissioners of the District, the Senate of the United States summarily laid the nomination on the table with almost entire unanimity — there were only six dissentients, we believe. In spite of all this, Mr. Porter still holds that Mr. Shepherd, at the very crisis of his downfall, "had done more than any one man to make Washington beautiful and prosperous," albeit that, as we read on another page, "the people of the District were pumped dry." The prosperity of a city, accordingly, seems to be something which can be divorced from the prosperity of its inhabitants, and may sometimes be greatest when the latter are left "flaccid and drained," like mice in an exhausted receiver.

A DRIVE FOR TROTTERS.

The *Turf, Field and Farm* has an article calling for the provision of a trotting drive on the west side of the Park for light vehicles, and complaining of the favor shown the saddle horses in the exclusive use of a bridle path. There is no doubt that, considering the place which the trotting horse occupies as a national amusement, there ought to be some place near the city in which he could be shown and enjoyed by the very few who can own him; but the difficulty is that a special drive for trotters would be, were there room for it on the west side of the Park, which there is not, simply a racecourse, with all that the name implies. What owners of trotting horses want is a track to "speed" them on; for ordinary "jogging" the ordinary roads do well enough. But speeding means racing, and racing means the attendance of vast crowds, who would soon ruin any adjacent vegetation, and in fact destroy every semblance of a park. We can think of nothing just now better fitted to ruin the trees, grass, and shrubbery of the Park, and drive women, children, and quiet men away from it, than the introduction into it of a trotting course. If such a thing should be provided by the city, the Harlem Flats are the place for it. There is no place on the west side of the Park level enough for it.

The owners of trotting horses would do a great deal to ennoble and dignify trotting if they could somehow dissociate it from liquor. Nothing does more to degrade it as an amusement than the need which nearly every trotting man seems to feel of filling himself at some period in his jaunt with more or less rum, gin, brandy, or whiskey. The result is that roads frequented by trotters are sure to be lined with groggeries, which makes them always undesirable for the general public.

This alone would seem to make it necessary that trotters should have a park all to themselves, and there is no doubt that such a park or drive would be a great addition to the attractions of New York as a place of residence. All the great trotters in the country, as *Turf, Field and Farm* says, are apt sooner or later to find owners in this city, and there is naturally, both among strangers and residents, a strong desire to see them at work. A horse that any body is willing to give $20,000 or $40,000 for is always more or less of a curiosity, even if he cannot be seen showing off his paces, and there ought to be some better place to see him than the Seventh Avenue Boulevard, on which trotting horses now do their speeding. There is no good reason why better provision should not be made for them. All they need is a straight piece of road with a soft road-bed kept watered, with raised sidewalks for the spectators, and reserved exclusively for light vehicles. It would hardly be necessary to prohibit other pleasure carriages from entering it, as they generally have a wholesome dread of the trotting man doing twenty miles an hour on three or four cocktails, and priding himself on the closeness with which he can shave anything he meets or overtakes.

It would be mere affectation, however, to discuss the duty of the city toward trotters without mentioning that there is a moral view of the trotting horse which would make a good many taxpayers unwilling to go to any expense about him. In the first place, a really good trotter is always, or almost always, a rich man's toy. No person of moderate means can afford to own one. In the second place, the trotter in a very large number of cases causes the ruin of the poor young men who have a taste for him. As soon as a poor man gets a fancy for a fast horse, his bank or his till is very apt to suffer sooner or later. There is no more seductive form of extravagance. The man who begins modestly with a three-minute horse and thinks this is all he will ever desire, has not speeded him "on the road" or "talked horse" at the stable very often without a feeling that true happiness can-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be had short of a two-forty horse; and the two-forty horse has not been enjoyed very long before a two-thirty or two-twenty horse is found necessary to a full and rounded life, together with a Brewster wagon, and costly robes, and a gorgeous white coat. These rises in the scale of enjoyment, of course, cost awfully. Every ten seconds of increase in speed has to be paid for at a tremendous rate, and there are few men of small means who, once started on this road of extravagance, have the courage to draw off before they "burst up." There are but few trotting horses in this city to-day which at some period in their career have not wrecked a fond owner.

And then, after everything has been said for the strain put on nerve and muscle by holding a trotter, or still more a pair of trotters, going at a high rate of speed, it still remains true that driving a wagon with legs tightly wrapped up, is not exercise for a young or middle-aged man of sedentary habits. It gives him fresh air and a gentle jogging, which are all that an old lady needs, but a man who has sat over a desk all day needs something much more active and stirring in order to be really well. We presume that, if the truth were known, the amount of "kidney trouble" among highly fed business men, fostered or hastened by confining their exercise to light-wagon driving, with frequent drinks on the road, would be found rather startling.

ENGLAND: MR. GLADSTONE AND THE IRISH QUESTION.

LONDON, December 31, 1885.

NOTHING was more surprising all through the late elections than the silence of both members and constituencies regarding Ireland. If you had asked any thoughtful politician which was the most serious question before the country, which would most tax the wisdom of Parliament, he would have answered, the question of Ireland. Yet candidates referred in few and vague words to the subject. Some did not refer at all. The practice of questioning them on their views has become common of late years, and sometimes this process of interrogation lasts for half an hour after nearly every meeting the candidate holds. They were questioned on all imaginable English and many foreign subjects, but scarcely at all about Ireland. Was this because candidates and members did not recognize the gravity of the position, or because they tried to turn their eyes away from a disagreeable subject, or because they really did not know what to think, wish, or propose regarding Irish troubles and demands? Probably all these causes had something to do with this strange silence, but the last cause most. Anyhow, we had this phenomenon of a whole nation ignoring, while it elected its governors, the first and chief problem those governors have to face.

The election was hardly over, and Mr. Parnell's Parliamentary strength perceived to have been doubled by it, when the newspapers began to discuss the situation, and men asked how the Queen's Government was to be carried on with neither English party in a majority of the whole House of Commons. Suddenly, about the 16th of December, it was announced in the press that Mr. Gladstone had made up his mind to propose a scheme of home rule—*i. e.*, a scheme for yielding to Ireland a separate Parliament. This statement did not come from him, and he declared it presently to be unauthorized and not to represent his mind correctly. Such a disavowal, however, admitted more than it denied. The inner circle of his party already knew that Mr. Gladstone's mind had advanced much on the question, so no one now doubts that he is prepared to create a new Irish Parliament in Dublin, though as to the details of the scheme, and the relation of such a Parliament to the imperial one at Westminster, he still stands uncommitted. How his view came out has not been fully ascertained, but it is generally believed that he addressed, in his capacity of Privy Councillor, a letter to the Queen, suggesting that the subject should be dealt with by Parliament, and offering to do his best to coöperate with the present Government in its settlement; that the Queen, as in duty bound, laid this letter before her Ministers; and that through them or some person about the court its contents, or an inaccurate version thereof, found their way to publicity.

The country was startled, needlessly and unreasonably startled, because the situation was already so grave that nothing Mr. Gladstone might intend could make it more so, and because those who had keenly scrutinized his previous utterances must have seen in which direction his mind was travelling. Startled, however, it was. Among most of the Liberals, respect for their leader and faith in his wisdom struggled with alarm at the novelty of the proposal. Having been accustomed to regard the Irish Nationalists as enemies, and having just suffered grievously at the polls from their hostility, they were not prepared to hear that these Nationalists were substantially in the right, and that the Irish demand ought to be granted. Their thoughts, their comprehension of the whole position, had lagged far behind those of the leaders who perceived the difficulty of resisting the wishes of so enormous a majority of Irish members as Mr. Parnell commands; and it was now first that they woke up to see facts as they are. The Tories were at first frightened, thinking it might be all up with their prospects; but after a day or two, when they perceived how much surprised Liberals also were, and how doubtful it was whether his party was prepared to follow Mr. Gladstone, they began to rub their hands in glee. Now, at last, had come that disruption of the Liberals for which they had been waiting and praying so long. Now was their arch-enemy delivered into their hands, abandoned by his followers, discredited before the country. The Tory press could ascribe his action to nothing but a fierce longing to get back to power: for the sake of this he was prepared to surrender to Mr. Parnell, and purchase his vote of eighty-six by sacrificing the unity and greatness of the empire. Stories flew about of secret communications between the Nationalist leader and the old man at Hawarden; even interviews were spoken of, although there is no foundation for any such tales. While the regular party men took this tone, the moderate Tories, and moderate Liberals no less, became seriously uneasy. They had all along thought an Irish Parliament a dangerous, indeed almost a fatal, experiment; and Mr. Gladstone's adhesion to the notion seemed to bring it within the horizon of practical politics. They acquitted him of being moved by the desire for office, because if that had been his object he would evidently not have written to the Queen and proposed to help the Government, but would have tried to turn Lord Salisbury out by Mr. Parnell's help before revealing his own purposes. But they thought his change of views (not understanding how far they had developed months and months ago) sudden and alarming, calculated to increase that distrust with which he has long inspired them. The more advanced Liberals, and those especially who have been attached to Mr. Gladstone personally, were disposed to consider fairly and favorably any proposal he might make. Still, they regretted the way in which this proposal had come out. It had the advantage, an immense advantage, of being recommended to the nation by his persuasive eloquence. It seemed to have been made, primarily to the Queen, incidentally, as it turned out, to the country, without consultation with some of his most important colleagues in the late Ministry. And in point of fact its disclosure was followed, after several days, by a letter from Lord Hartington, addressed to the Chairman of his Election Committee and published as soon as written, in which that statesman, who has hitherto been deemed Mr. Gladstone's heir apparent in the leadership, declared himself opposed to the notion of a separate Irish legislature. This letter, having been written after a consultation with Mr. Goschen and Sir William Harcourt, was taken to express their sentiments also, and produced no small impression. Since then the newspapers have been full of articles and letters on the topic, which, of course, dwarfs all others. There have been few speeches, because the Christmas holidays have intervened, and because men are waiting to express themselves in Parliament, which, it is now rumored, will proceed to active business soon after the middle of January.

A more perplexing position cannot be imagined. That nobody knows what will happen when the new House of Commons meets is the least part of the difficulty. Nobody seems to have any scheme for dealing with the Irish question, and yet it is plain that nothing else can be done while it stops the way. Hitherto the English advocates of home rule have, with few exceptions, been silent. Either they don't know their own minds on details, or they are waiting for Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Parnell is silent; so are his followers. Whether they have a practical scheme; whether, if they have it, they will propound it; whether their silence is due to internal divisions, or to a fear of the extreme or Fenian wing, reported to be not very strong at present in Ireland, but believed to be strong in America—all this is mere matter of conjecture. Accordingly, the assailants of home rule have it all their own way in our press. They descant on the difficulties, indeed, the perils, open and hidden, of an Irish Parliament, and they have an easy task, for those difficulties can hardly be overstated. They show how it would be necessary either to construct a new constitution for the three kingdoms in granting a separate legislature to Ireland, or else to admit an amount of independence scarcely short of complete separation, and they point out that there is no security that by either scheme friendly relations would be established between the two countries. The Duke of Argyll points out, in a letter full of his usual force and eloquence, that the parallel of the United States is inapplicable. Minor writers insist that to yield up the control of the police to an Irish authority would not merely endanger the person and property of any unpopular individual, but would enable such an authority to raise and drill a large armed force. The Protestants of Ulster—Liberals calmly, Orangemen fiercely, but scarcely more earnestly—insist that they must not be left to the mercies of an Irish Parliament, and predict civil war as the probable consequence of such an experiment. But while so much argument and invective are directed against the suggestion, no one deals with the other side of the question, and tells us in what manner the double problem which confronts us is to be solved.

It is a double problem because it has a Parliamentary side as well as a local side. Eighty-six members of the House of Commons, acting as a compact body on all occasions, will be able (unless checked by some new rules of procedure) to paralyze the House of Commons. It is not merely that they will be able to protract discussion to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interminable lengths, but that by the use of their votes they will make it almost impossible to carry on the ordinary business of the country, except by keeping a very large body of Ministerial members always in attendance. It is found hard enough now to keep the legal quorum of forty during certain hours of the evening, or when there is a dull subject under discussion; how much harder will it be to have at least one hundred always ready to outvote the Nationalists when they choose to make themselves disagreeable, which presumably they will do whenever they see their chance? Stricter rules may be introduced, but this is what the Tory party has hitherto objected to, lest the freedom of debate should be curtailed for all members; or the Nationalist members may be suspended, but what a mischievous precedent wholesale suspensions will set. As for the difficulties in Ireland itself, the painful experience of 1880, 1881, and 1882 enables us to realize them. If there is another strike against the payment of rent, if agrarian outrages reappear, as is to be expected, fresh coercion acts will be called for, and Ireland will again be dealt with as a hostile country. England is doubtless so much the stronger country that she can govern by the sword. But will the English democracy persevere in so governing? Will not every year aggravate the situation, till at last either home rule is conceded or the English have become so exasperated as to abolish representative institutions in Ireland altogether, and rule her as in the days of Cromwell?

The perception of these difficulties makes some of our politicians who see all the objections to an Irish Parliament slow to declare themselves against it. But for the moment the tide runs against Mr. Gladstone—or the plan attributed to him—even in his own party. Of the Liberal members of the new Parliament whose opinions have been ascertained, only a small minority express themselves in favor of an Irish legislature. The rest, while prepared to go more or less far in the grant of county boards and other reforms of local government, stand firm for the maintenance of the union as at present. In these circumstances a change of government does not seem likely to take place at the beginning of the session. But how will a ministry in a minority of eighty-two be able to live through a session, even if it receives support against the Irish from a section of its Liberal opponents? Y.

WHAT ARE THE CAUSES OF THE CONSERVATIVE REACTION IN ENGLAND?

OXFORD, December 26, 1885.

THE well-to-do classes in England have for the moment gone over to Conservatism. This is the prominent fact of the situation and the true result of the elections. The electoral returns, indeed, hardly show the full strength of the dominant Conservative sentiment. The Tory vote in the towns is balanced by the Radical vote in the counties, and (what is of more consequence) hundreds of men who either voted Liberal or did not vote at all, have become more than half Conservative in their hearts. There were many Liberal voters who would have felt a chastened satisfaction at the return of a decisive Ministerial majority. My aim in this letter is not to describe the present state of public feeling. It must be patent enough in every English newspaper which reaches New York. My object is to state briefly the causes which have brought about a condition of opinion as noteworthy as any which I have witnessed during my lifetime. They will not be discovered by even the most candid of partisans, but they are not hard for any one to find who stands outside politics and keeps open his eyes and ears.

(1.) The consideration which lies at the bottom of all the other causes which I am about to enumerate is that the Constitution of England has, for the last twenty years at least, been growing far more democratic than the average sentiment of educated Englishmen. The last extension of the suffrage has revealed to every one that the country, which is still governed by nobles and by rich men, has adopted or slid into a democratic polity. There is a momentary want of correspondence between the institutions and the habits of the nation. This want of harmony produces two results. Radicals like Mr. Chamberlain demand changes which correspond with the theory of a democratic constitution, but which do not really answer to the wishes of the most influential classes. Well-to-do persons, whether calling themselves Liberals or Tories, refuse to sympathize with innovations which may correspond with the form, but are at present alien to the spirit, of the Constitution. There is no need that I should show in detail how naturally this state of matters fosters Conservatism.

(2.) Mr. Gladstone's last Ministry has been a Government of failure. This is a point on which among fair judges no real difference of opinion can exist. Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, when they went out of office, had not a friend left among Continental statesmen. They had sacrificed a great deal (rightly enough, in my judgment) to maintain the friendship of France, and yet they had nearly embroiled the country with the French Republic. Of the fiasco in Egypt it is painful and needless to say much. Gordon's death and the whole train of events which led to it are known to all the world, and will not soon be forgotten by large bodies of Englishmen. Last of all, their Irish policy had not conciliated Ireland. When it became known that not a single Liberal was returned for an Irish constituency, the political failure of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy, which had long been suspected by observers, became visible to every one. Let it be noted that I neither mean to assert nor to imply that for the whole of these failures the Liberal Cabinet was responsible. A later generation will recognize the immense service rendered to the whole United Kingdom by the conduct of the Government at the time of the Phenix Park assassinations. To their Ministry's moderation and firmness it is due that the nation was not carried away by a burst of passion as natural as that which marked the outbreak of the Indian mutiny, and even more calamitous. But failure, even when excusable, is none the less failure, and a government whose guidance leads to disaster has no right to expect confidence or popularity. The late Cabinet, moreover, so mismanaged matters as to incur condemnation by whatever criterion their conduct was judged. Their policy in Egypt was at least as much opposed to the principles of Mr. Bright as to the principles of Lord Salisbury.

(3.) Mr. Chamberlain's radicalism may (it is possible) have gained votes for the Opposition in the rural districts. But it has shaken the allegiance of the Liberals in our cities. The shock given by his proposals did not arise nearly so much from their violence as from their inconsiderateness. Tory pamphleteers and orators accuse the Radical leader of dishonesty. In this, as is constantly the case with partisans, they miss their mark. The charge which, to judge from his acts and from his language, he cannot easily rebut, is want, not of honesty, but of knowledge. It is hard to believe that he understands these laws of political economy which he seems to think may be set aside as easily as an Act of Parliament can be repealed, and it is absolutely certain that a politician who, with a light heart, suggests the disestablishment of the Church of England, knows nothing of the sentiment prevailing among large bodies of his countrymen. Moreover, Mr. Chamberlain's recklessness is but an example of a vice which, from the nature of things, is apt to infect Radicals. A party which demands rights or privileges for the people is apt to assume its own necessary popularity; and leaders who rely on the support of the crowd constantly forget that the supposed opinion of the people is in many cases little better than a political fiction, and that even the support of numbers will not for any length of time, in a country like England, enable a politician to dispense with the confidence of men of common sense. The tone adopted by some extreme Radicals toward Mr. Goschen—a statesman whose influence and position have been immensely raised since the beginning of the electoral contest—is a specimen of the tone used toward the whole body of so-called moderate Liberals. These men have their defects, but the alienation of Whigs or moderate Liberals means the strengthening of Conservatism, and, should the alienation continue, the ultimate triumph of the Conservative party.

(4.) Among educated Liberals faith in Mr. Gladstone's judgment has vanished. There has always, indeed, lurked among Whigs and Radicals of the type represented by the late Mr. Fawcett a distrust of Mr. Gladstone's political methods. No one of common sense ever doubted or can doubt his public spirit. No one, except the writers in the *St. James's Gazette*, can believe that he is prepared to sacrifice the interest of the nation on the altar of his own vanity. But it is quite possible to believe, and thousands of Liberals do now believe, that the late Premier is wanting in balance, is guided too much by the impulse of the moment, and is, in some respects, essentially out of sympathy both with the creed of ordinary Liberals and with many of the strongest of English sentiments. He may no doubt be, as his admirers assert, morally superior to the mass of Englishmen. What is certain is, that somehow or other his character differs from the character of the men of whom he has been the leader. It is equally certain that nothing but the continued success of a statesman's policy will ever make him popular, or even tolerated, among a people whom he does not understand, or who do not understand him. That the policy of the Liberal Ministry has, apparently at least, led to failure after failure, I have already pointed out. That the peculiarities of Mr. Gladstone's genius or temper make him incomprehensible to the majority even of his followers, is apparent enough from incidents familiar to all your readers.

What, for example, can an ordinary Englishman of common sense think of the treatment received by Gordon? If the General was sent to Khartum with Mr. Gladstone's full cognizance and approbation, what is it possible to think, in face of the calamities which ensued, but that either the Prime Minister exhibited the most extraordinary lack of foresight, or the General (which, without further evidence, one is not justified in believing) was the victim of something like treachery? If, on the other hand, as I see suggested in the *Nation*, Mr. Gladstone sent the English hero to risk life and credit in deference, not to Mr. Gladstone's own judgment, but to the clamors of the London press, what can one think of the Premier's firmness or principle? Trifles, however, are, in matters of character, as significant as important transactions. All the world has been the witness to Mr. Gladstone's disastrous controversy with Professor Huxley. The controversy may be well termed a disaster for two reasons: it proves that the most eminent of English statesmen can write with dogmatic assurance on topics of which, from the nature of things, he can know little, and of which, after the Professor's rejoinder, there is reason to believe

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he knows nothing. It shows, further, that the pilot on whose political sagacity England will have probably to rely at as desperate a crisis as any through which the country has ever passed, is occupied with the interests of theology rather than with the immediate and pressing problems of politics. It is said on good authority that Lord Palmerston used seriously and, with some temper to maintain that Bacon was the author of the plays attributed to Shakspere. If his Lordship had, while at the head of the Government, or even when in temporary retirement, published essays in support of the paradox by which he was captivated, he would assuredly not have retained the public confidence in his good sense.

Look, lastly, at the whole series of rumors, denials, and explanations which half reveal and half obscure Mr. Gladstone's attitude toward home rule. It were unfair positively to assume his responsibility for the conjectural statement of his views, but he certainly is responsible for his opinions still being a matter of conjecture. All England believes that he is favorable to some form of home rule. If this belief be well founded, then it is hardly possible to use language grave enough to describe the evil done to the whole United Kingdom by the mode in which the leader of the Liberal party has suffered his opinion on a matter of vital importance to be irregularly revealed. If, on the other hand, the general belief be unfounded, why is it that Mr. Gladstone cannot dispel the prevailing error? Lord Hartington has not half his leader's command of language, but Lord Hartington has contrived in a few plain sentences to make his position perfectly clear. This Mr. Gladstone cannot or will not do. It would be impossible not to attribute this failure simply to want of will, were it not for a hazy recollection that years ago, when an impertinent fanatic asked Mr. Gladstone whether he was not a Roman Catholic, Mr. Gladstone could neither leave the question alone nor dispose of it by a plain answer. Nor will Americans have forgotten the difficulty there has been found in defining satisfactorily Mr. Gladstone's attitude toward Southern secession. No doubt all this unconscious mystification (for such it may fairly be believed to be) arises from idiosyncrasies in the great statesman's character which are compatible with the highest talents, and also with indubitable zeal for the welfare of his country. But if American critics will consider how utterly impossible it would have been for Mr. Lincoln or Mr. Seward to have commanded the faith of the North, or, for that matter, of the South either, if he had from any peculiar turn of mind concealed his view of secession under unsatisfactory explanations or inconclusive denials of authoritative rumors that he contemplated granting to the South everything which the Confederates could demand except nominal independence—such a critic will understand why Mr. Gladstone, in spite of his great services to the nation, inspires among hundreds of his own followers every feeling of respect except faith in his judgment. A. V. Dicey.

THE "EUMENIDES" AT CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

London, December 17, 1885.

To many that were present at the representation of the "Œdipus" given at Harvard in May, 1881, a doubt must have occurred as to how much of the impressiveness of the play was due to its ample and appropriate setting. Sanders Theatre, if not designed with a view to such uses, at any rate accords in its general plan with what is known of the Greek theatres. The arrangement of the orchestra space and the steps leading from it to the stage needed small alteration, while the great height and breadth of the proscenium arch furnished room for a scene of unusual grandeur, and the spaciousness of the auditorium gave to the spectator that sense of freedom that must have been felt by the Athenians, as they sat on the carved slope of the Acropolis to listen to the verses of Sophocles.

Without any of these advantages, the performance of the "Eumenides" of Æschylus recently given at Cambridge, by members of the University, proved deeply interesting. The little hall used for the occasion, and somewhat humorously named the Theatre Royal, is provided at one end with a stage about eighteen feet square. In front of this and only a yard lower, a space was arranged for the evolutions of the chorus; still further forward toward the audience sat the band. The tragedy was shortened, and divided into a prologue and three acts, for each of which there was a separate scene. The prologue showed a terrace looking off upon a rocky glen, the site of the Delphic Oracle. The *Priestess* appears, and, after a short invocation, enters to consult the divine voice, but returns immediately and falls to the ground horror-struck at what she has seen. The first act takes place in the interior of the shrine, a heavy Doric temple opening upon the sacred cave. The *Furies* are lying about the stage asleep, while *Orestes* clings for protection to the central altar, behind which stands *Apollo*. The god promises to protect the suppliant. To evade the fury of his pursuers he sends him, under the guidance of *Hermes*, to the temple of Pallas at Athens. The ghost of the murdered *Clytemnestra* enters, and with much effort arouses the sleeping *Furies*, who descend to the orchestra to sing their chorus of rage at the escape of their victim, and are then driven forth by *Apollo*.

In the second act *Orestes* reaches the Temple of Pallas—built in advanced Ionic style—and, invoking the protection of the goddess, falls at the base of her statue. The *Furies* enter one by one, tracking the victim by his footsteps. They discover his asylum, and sing a song of fury and vengeance. At the end of this, *Pallas* appears in answer to *Orestes's* prayer, and, having listened to both sides of his cause, promises to have it tried before a jury of Athenian elders. The *Furies* sing a third chorus, and are driven from the temple by the goddess, who stands at the door, spear in hand, and protects the suppliant with her glittering ægis.

The scene of the third act is the summit of the Areopagus. A herald having sounded the summons at *Pallas's* command, the goddess mounts her lofty seat, and the cause is tried. *Orestes* admits that he slew his mother, the accusing *Furies* urge the enormity of the crime, while *Apollo* testifies that he incited *Orestes* to commit the deed and gave absolution for it. The jury being equally divided, *Pallas* gives her casting vote for acquittal, and finally appeases the anger of the *Furies* by offering them a residence in her city and an honored place in its theogony.

While treated with unfailing earnestness, all the characters, except, perhaps, those of the priestess and the chorus, were played with marked and intentional formalism. The question precisely to what degree the Athenian actors were realistic in the presentation of their parts, will probably long remain open. On the one hand, we have the fact of their stilted shoes, their padded garments, and their rigid masks. On the other, in one of his dialogues Plato makes an actor talk of acting in a way that is hard to reconcile with any theory of merely conventional expression. Whether the young men at Harvard were right or wrong in their attempt to interpret Sophocles with all the help they were able to derive from action and elocution, it is clear that the Cambridge undergraduates adopted a different course with Æschylus. The speeches were delivered with calm dignity, and illustrated with slow and measured gestures. The result was far from being dull.

In addition to the chorus music and an orchestral prelude to each scene, the action of the play was accompanied by a running musical commentary, and if the spectator now and then found the formalism of the actors inexpressive, the music must have suggested the meaning to him. Although distinctly modern in quality, Mr. Sanford's composition admirably suits the spirit of the play, and, there can be no doubt, contributed much to its success. Especially was this the case with the awakening of the *Furies* and with their discovery of *Orestes* at the statue of Athena. Some scenes, however, received an almost melodramatic note from the excessive emphasis given by the kettledrum. The members of the chorus sang with spirit and apparent accuracy, and, besides acting out their own part with intelligence, greatly heightened the effect of several scenes on the stage by making inarticulate sounds, reinforced by the band. Although the smallness of the orchestral space and the insufficient difference in level between it and the stage seriously hampered their movements, they contrived in the choric dances to combine a pleasing rhythm of motion with a large measure of dramatic expression. Their dresses were grotesque without absurdity, and the judicious use of dull foil ornaments lent an effect of weirdness.

The chief characters were, of course, played by young men of marked athletic beauty. The *Apollo* in particular quite reminded one of the antique statues in many of his poses. But decidedly the most interesting figure in the performance was that of *Pallas Athena*, played by a "sweet girl graduate" from Girton College, whose acting in the "Electra," given there some time since, is said to have been of distinguished excellence. The young lady's picture of the clear-eyed goddess was charming in its exalted dignity and simple earnestness, and her soft precision of speech was most grateful to the ear. To one, however, accustomed to the Continental method of pronouncing Greek, or to that in use in our own colleges at home, the English sounding of the letters seemed often harsh, especially in the recurrence of the *ow* (cow) sound for the diphthong alpha upsilon, and of the *z* sound for sigma.

In the matter of the dresses, one felt a lack of intelligent supervision of the draping of the garments, and of sufficient rehearsal in wearing them. To reproduce on a moving model the effect of classic drapery, one must not only know the proper shape of each garment, but must also have a closer acquaintance with the nature of modern stuffs than is usually found within the walls of a college. In a few cases, however, the imitation of archaic stiffness was excellent, as in that of the Athenian herald, who looked like one of Flaxman's figures come to life.

As has been hinted, the scenery was rather unsatisfactory. It would doubtless be hazardous to attempt, with the imperfect material furnished by modern archæology, a reconstruction of the wooden prototypes of the Greek temple; but we need not on that account rest content with the ignorance and crude color sense of a provincial scene painter. The play would have been more impressive had its two temple scenes and the rocks of the Areopagus been painted less harshly.

It is in no carping mood that these few flaws in the representation of the play have been suggested. All who took part in the work showed obvious and conscientious earnestness, and their success was of the highest interest and impressiveness. L. E. O.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DAUDET'S 'SAPHO' DRAMATIZED.

PARIS, December 28, 1885.

ALPHONSE DAUDET holds a peculiar place in our modern romantic literature. He does not belong to the old-fashioned, somewhat artificial school, which may be said to be still represented by Octave Feuillet; he does not belong any more to the true naturalist school, which has Zola for its master. He is realistic without being systematically vulgar; he does not absolutely prefer odious, hideous, loathsome subjects and characters; he is not a pessimist, and there is in him an irrepressible touch of the gay, cheerful, and optimist South. Though he has ridiculed the South in his 'Tartarin' (which might be in many respects compared to the productions of Mark Twain), in 'Numa Roumestan,' and quite recently in 'Tartarin sur les Alpes' (a New Year's book of the season, which has met with much success, partly owing to its charming illustrations), Alphonse Daudet is a child of the South; there is no real sadness, no true melancholy in him. There is a vein of true sentiment, sometimes an outburst of real pathos, in some of his works: in 'Fromont jeune et Risler aîné,' in 'Jack'; but on the whole the balance always falls on the side of humor, gayety, and hope. What is very remarkable and even admirable in all Daudet's productions is what I cannot call otherwise than life. There is an extraordinary vitality and movement through all his work—no system, no elaborate style, no perception of effort; his descriptions are photographs, but they are not dry: "il y a de l'air," as the painters say of a landscape. His characters also have "de l'air": they are all more or less volatile, they have nothing statuesque, they are carried away on the current of life—a current which is sometimes so rapid that you can hardly follow it. In this respect also Daudet belongs truly to the South; he is not a dreamer, he is essentially an actor: "Act, act, in the living present."

There does not seem to be much system in his choice of subjects. He does not pretend, like Zola, to give us a new "Comédie Humaine." His receptive mind takes in to-day one thing, to-morrow another: he is a mirror. You can always recognize some living character in his novels; every Parisian knows who the 'Nabab' was, and can give the real names to all the characters of that novel, as well as to those of 'Numa Roumestan.' The poet of 'Jack' is still living; the verses which are cited by Daudet in the novel were really written by this poet "without a heart." I confess that I do not know whom Daudet had in view when he wrote his last novel, 'Sapho,' for this takes us into a world which is not familiar to me—the world of the studios of painters and sculptors. This world is, in many respects, quite apart. It is very different from the real world, though I hasten to say that the artists of very great eminence are a part of this real world; but the rising artists, the beginners, those who are only known in a small circle, form a sort of society which has a freedom unknown in the regular society. In dress, in manners, in almost all the details of life, this artistic world affects a license and has an originality which make it worthy of study. It is not the "demi-monde," but it has its illegitimate *liaisons*, which sometimes assume the seriousness of marriages. The women who are met among the painters, the artists, the literary men who live in their company, are not venal, and in this respect they are much superior to the women of the "demi-monde." They are more intellectual, more imaginative; they are living in a higher stage. They are to be seen on varnishing day, with their friends, as anxious as they can be themselves, as curious, as uneasy. There is something of the old "Bohemia" left in this world of painters, but it is no longer the "Bohême" of Henri Mürger, composed only of very young men and women: it is a Bohemia where you meet men with gray beards, and old models who have become semi-respectable matrons.

This curious world is very well painted in 'Sapho.' Daudet shows us a young diplomat lost in it, and falling in love with one of its stars. As usually happens, the innocent youth does not look back on the past, he only thinks of the present; he forms a *liaison* with Sapho, and it is only gradually that he learns that she has been the friend, the mistress, of almost all the men whom he meets; he becomes gradually disenchanted, a retrospective jealousy torments him, but he cannot break the chain. Daudet has painted in his novel very artistically the slavery of these curious connections formed outside of the social rules; his analysis is painful, minute, excellent. It was an unfortunate idea, however, to try to transform the novel into a drama, and, though Daudet has been helped in this attempt by a clever dramatist, M. Belot, "Sapho," as a drama, as it is now played on the French stage, is a failure.

The reasons for it are obvious. The character of the illegitimate marriage, if the word is allowable (there is a very coarse French word for it which I dare not repeat), is very peculiar. Its essential and necessary elements are habit and a certain sort of materialistic love, which also takes the form of habit. In a novel you can show a man struggling against this form of love, and you can show also the woman putting on him the shirt of Nessus, forcing herself on her lover, coming between him and his family, having Time for an ally, and habit and the natural laziness and weakness of a feeble heart. On the stage the element of time disappears; you must show us the human passions at their crisis. All the slow influences which bring a lover under a yoke, which by degrees destroy his sense of pride, of responsibility, which debilitate him and bring him always back, contented or discontented, at the feet of Sapho—all these influences disappear. The quarrels of lovers in Molière are delightful, but they are mere episodes, and they never deceive us; in "Sapho," the hero and the heroine quarrel in a very different manner. First the man takes *Sapho;* in another act he leaves her; in a third act, he takes her again; in the fourth, he takes her and leaves her again. This perpetual divorcing and marrying is very tiresome and very senseless, especially as, in a few hours, the author cannot explain so many revolutions of mind.

There is, besides, no real drama in the development of the character of Sapho. She has no morality, and it seems perfectly natural to her to leave one man and to follow another: she is unconscious of her own depravity. She wants a home, but it is indifferent to her whether this home is permanent or temporary. She is like a child who should consider any woman as a mother. If she has a preference, it is for the man who is the least worthy of respect; and the morality of the novel is only to be found in this secret preference. Sapho has had many lovers—poets, painters, sculptors; she has always in her heart preferred an unfortunate engraver, who has for her sake committed forgery, and who is in prison. She probably feels her superiority over a man who has made such a sacrifice for her, and when his term comes to an end she is drawn to him by an irresistible attraction. She abandons the young diplomat whom she has separated from his friends, from his family; who has become her slave; who has given up his career for her. She leaves him, and returns, without any apparent reason, to the man whom she despises, but who has been in prison for her.

The painful scenes which mark the development of the passion of the young diplomat, the heartlessness of Sapho, the tragical dulness and bitterness of their "faux ménage," are admirable elements for the novel, but they are totally unfit for the stage. The drama, as it is played, can only be endured by virtue of the secondary characters, who are very cleverly drawn, and are always amusing in Daudet's works. But is it not a singular eulogy to say that the secondary parts of the play are much superior to the principal? These secondary parts are essentially Parisian; they belong to a well-defined latitude; such as they are, they are perfect pictures of life.

I cannot much recommend this new system of drawing a drama out of a novel. In a pecuniary point of view there is certainly much to be said for it. There is no doubt that a moderately successful play will win for an author much more money than a very successful book. The railways bring every day to Paris an army of foreigners and of *provinciaux*, who fill all the theatres every night. A play with the name of Daudet, of Dumas, of Sardou, of Pailleron, will always make money, even if it is not good; and if it is good it will net its author a small fortune. Such considerations, however, do not concern the critic; and it is an undoubted fact that a bad drama hurts the novel which has furnished its elements. I had read 'Sapho' once with pleasure; after having seen the drama I tried to read it again, and I could not find my former satisfaction. There was something between the author and me; I could no longer give to Sapho, to her lovers, imaginary faces; I saw before me the actors and actresses who had personified their parts. Everything was changed; it was a new world, the vulgar world of a theatre. Nothing was left to my own mind. 'Sapho,' as I read it now, seemed like a new book, and a very inferior book. The finest thoughts are those which have never been expressed. There is also a certain ideality left in a printed book which is lost when the thoughts and the characters come before us in a living form. I would never advise a good novelist to succumb to this terrible temptation of the stage. The dramatist and the novelist ought to be different men; they require different qualities, and almost irreconcilable faculties. The dramatist needs precision, action, almost brutality; his color must be strong, often coarse; he must take us into the midst of passions and show us their culmination. The novelist has Time on his side: he can work like nature itself, he can reveal to us the most hidden springs of passion. He is a thinker, a philosopher. The dramatist is essentially an actor.

Correspondence.

THE COMMITTEES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A full month, at least a fifth part of the average of Congressional sessions, has passed, and not only is no business done, but the committees who are to prepare the business, not to speak of doing it, have only just been announced. What a medley they form! Square men in round holes, and men that are not square in holes which at least ought to be so. There seems to be no pretence that they are made up with reference to the settlement of vital questions of national interest on broad principles of statesmanship, the object being simply to reconcile the furious jealousy of partisans, though why, for any honest purpose, any human being can want such positions it is difficult to perceive. If the Speaker has great power in this respect, he has to pay dearly for it. Daniel in the lion's den would furnish a fair comparison—that is, supposing the lions to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have given way to their natural appetites. But if the committees were not ready for business, business enough was ready for them. Bills by the thousand are heaped upon their heads, with no order of precedence and no standard of relative importance. Wrangling, intrigue, and anarchy are the only words which will describe the situation. It is this desperate struggle which has evolved the despotism of the Committee on Appropriations, the latter again resulting in the lamentable expedient which has been resorted to for relief.

The President is reported to have said, in relation to the silver question, that the subject had now passed beyond his control or direction; that he had not the slightest desire to influence in any way the consideration of Congress beyond the methods employed by him in his official message to direct their attention to the subject. If by this he means that he will not employ official favors to influence the votes of members, there can be nothing but praise for his decision. The supposed necessity of a contrary course is a curious reminder of the argument and practice which Sir Robert Walpole used in carrying on the British Government in a time of fearful Parliamentary corruption, a century and a half ago. It is to be hoped that we may find a shorter road to avoid the danger. But if the President means that, his functions being purely executive, it is not his business to help Congress and the country out of the slough into which they have fallen, it is much to be regretted that he should take this limited view of his duty. It was not to elect a mere mechanical instrument that ten millions of voters went to the polls in November, 1884. There is nothing extravagant in saying that he is bound to use every faculty and every discretion given to him within the Constitution and the laws to promote the welfare of the nation which has placed in his hands so solemn a trust. He, and he alone, more than any man or body of men in the country, has the power to open an avenue of escape. There would surely be nothing impertinent or revolutionary in asking Congress to take into serious consideration a report signed by eight Senators of both parties, approving of the admission of Cabinet officers to the floor of both houses.

At present the silver men have it all their own way. Expense being no obstacle, they can manufacture an apparent public sentiment at discretion. They can air their oratory in both houses without encountering any opponent able from his position to urge the national interest effectively against their schemes. They can block the action of the houses in the hundred ways offered by the legislative chaos. A Secretary of the Treasury joining in the debate, demanding precedence, or, as the French say, "urgency" for the question, with his responsibility for the national finances and backed by the national will, would soon put them in a different attitude. That is the way, and the only way, in which a satisfactory solution is possible of attainment.

There has been no President since Lincoln to whom such language could be addressed with any chance of success; but the increasing confidence of the country in the character and independence of Mr. Cleveland justifies the use of it.

G. B.

Boston, January 11, 1886.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION BILL.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have not seen the text of the Hoar Presidential Succession Bill, or any summary of the debate on it, but on reading your remark that the Secretary of State, on becoming acting President, could appoint a new Cabinet (with the exception of the Secretary of State), I wondered who in the event of the Secretary's death after such a Cabinet reorganization would succeed him; the next member in order of the new or old Cabinet? If the latter, on what grounds, since he is no longer a Cabinet officer? Is there any provision for this contingency, and if not, have we not here another "interesting question"?

C. R., jr.

New York, December 25, 1885.

[The bill leaves no room for doubt on this point. Its language is: "In case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or if there be none, *or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Treasury* . . . shall act as President." Of course this means the Secretary of the Treasury who is in office at the time when the Secretary of State dies, whether he be the appointee of the dead President or Vice-President, or the selection of the Secretary of State who has become acting President.—Ed. Nation.]

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In a recent issue you took the ground that under the proposed new law the Secretary of State, should he become acting President, must nevertheless remain Secretary of State, just as a President *pro tem.* of the Senate, who should become acting President of the United States under the old law, would remain President *pro tem.* of the Senate. "The reason," you add, "in each case is the same, because it is only by virtue of holding the office of Secretary of State or President *pro tem.* of the Senate that he can act as President."

A similar interpretation of the Constitution of Maryland would leave this State at this moment without any one authorized to "discharge the duties of" Governor. The Constitution provides (Art. 2, sec. 7): "In case of any vacancy in the office of Governor during the recess of the Legislature, the President of the Senate shall discharge the duties of said office until a Governor is elected, as herein provided for"; namely, by the Legislature at its next session.

In accordance with this provision, a "vacancy in the office of Governor" having occurred some months ago, Mr. Lloyd, who had been elected President of the Senate at the opening of the January session, in 1884, assumed the "discharge" of "the duties of said office," and has continued to discharge them ever since, and will continue to discharge them, if he lives, till the election of a Governor by the Legislature at its coming session, some two weeks hence.

But Mr. Lloyd was elected Senator at the November election, 1881, and the Constitution provides (Art. 3, sec. 2) that each Senator shall "serve for four years from the date of his election." Now, Mr. Lloyd's successor in the Senate was elected on the 3d of last month, to "serve for four years from the date of his election." It follows, therefore, that Mr. Lloyd ceased to be Senator, and so ceased to be President of the Senate, on the 3d of last month; and that thereupon, if your argument is sound, his authority to discharge the duties of Governor was then vacated, and that the Secretary of State failed to do his duty under Art. 2, sec. 7 of the Constitution in not convening the Legislature to fill the vacancy.

E. J. Stearns.

Easton, Md., December 26.

[There is no doubt that the framers of the Maryland Constitution intended that the vacancy should be filled by the man who held the place of President of the Senate when it occurred. The language used is equivalent to saying "the *then* President of the Senate" shall become acting Governor and so continue until a new Governor is elected. The Federal Constitution does not provide that a particular officer shall succeed and hold the place until a new election, but only authorizes Congress to declare "what officer shall then act as President." It is a mooted question whether, under the law of 1792, a President *pro tem.* of the Senate who might succeed to the Presidency in this way would be entitled to discharge the duties of acting President in case his term as Senator expired before a new election for President were held; and this doubt constitutes a strong reason for changing the order of succession to a line of officers like the members of the Cabinet, who have no fixed term.—Ed. Nation.]

PLACE-SEEKING A POPULAR WEAKNESS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: It is very common talk among persons and in papers of the political proclivities which distinguish the *Nation*, that the people at large, those who do not expect office and do not want it, take little interest in the distribution of the governmental patronage so long as the public is well served by those in office. In this I think they are mistaken. I think the virus of the spoils system has infected very deeply the whole body politic of the country. Place-seeking has become a game in which a majority of the people are very much interested. Their sympathies are strongly enlisted with the contestants on their side. They feel very much as does a man who takes an interest in base-ball, and who, if a betting man, always stakes his money on the club which happens to represent the city in which he resides; and in any event, becomes intensely excited in the outcome of each game. Like some cutaneous eruptions, this strange manifestation is a symptom of deep-seated disease. The newspapers understand what the abnormal appetite of their readers demands, and publish long despatches every day from Washington acquainting their readers with the varying aspects of each struggle for perhaps a $1,500 per annum post-office. They describe the contest in much the same language a war correspondent would use in depicting a battle scene. To-day the friends of Smith, aspirant to the Postmastership at Podunk, "are fighting a gallant but hopeless battle." The next day "they have sent for reinforcements." Perhaps the day following, the succor has arrived in the shape of an influential delegation from the Podunk district armed with new affidavits, and "the tide of battle is turned."

If a change was impending in a $1,500 clerkship in any mercantile office, the newspapers would not spend their money freely in telegraphing and publishing facts and speculations as to the prospects of each applicant. Why do they do it in the case of a person seeking employment under the Government if the explanation I suggest above is not the true one?

O. S.

Chicago, Ill., January 7, 1886.

THE DEATH-RATE FROM CONSUMPTION.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The argument of Dr. Henry B. Baker, the able Superintendent of Vital Statistics of the State of Michigan, rests mainly on the following point, which he thinks has been well established, namely: that the death-rate from consumption

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

increases rapidly after the age of fifty. This point, he says, was first demonstrated in the vital statistics of Michigan for 1870. Let us see how solid a basis these statistics furnish.

In the first place, how are the vital statistics collected in Michigan? By the Supervisors of each township, who make an annual inquiry of the inhabitants of their respective townships as to the deaths which have occurred during the year! Mistakes enough are made when the law compels the certification of the cause of death by the physician in attendance before a permit for burial can be obtained. By what figure shall we multiply these mistakes when the cause of death is reported by a member of the family in which the death occurred, very often months after its occurrence? The world over, many deaths from disease attended by wasting, the other symptoms being more or less obscure, are set down as due to consumption; and these cases are more likely to occur under the age of five and over the age of fifty. In Michigan, a young and comparatively thinly-settled State, one would naturally expect an undue proportion of these cases; and that such an expectation is justified by the facts, the subjoined figures will show.

Secondly, it clearly appears that all deaths were not returned. According to the report, the death-rate for Michigan in 1870 was only 9 1-3 per thousand, a rate which shows in a moment that, at the most, not more than three-fifths of all deaths can have been reported.

Thirdly, the total number of deaths from consumption in Michigan in 1870 is given as 1,451. Now, merely for the sake of argument, let us suppose that in these 1,451 are included all the deaths from consumption during that year in the State, and no deaths from any cause other than consumption. It is surprising that a statistician of reputation should venture to base any argument on such small figures, and they the figures for only one year.

Let us for a moment contrast the Michigan statistics for 1870 with those of Massachusetts for the years 1875–1884 inclusive:

	Michigan, 1870.	Massachusetts, 1875–84.
Total deaths from consumption.....	1,451	56,053
Under the age of 5 years.....	.....135= 9.3 per ct.	2,705=4.8 per ct.
Between the ages of 20–40.....	.....602=41.5 per ct.	27,801=49.9 per ct.
After 50.	.....348= 24 per ct.	11,459=20.4 per ct.

A glance at these figures is enough to show that the Michigan statistics—and consequently the deductions drawn from them—are of very little value. The death-rate from consumption does not increase rapidly after fifty, but reaches its maximum between the ages of twenty and forty.

Doctor Baker asks for the statistics of the proportion of consumption to inhabitants at ages definitely stated, a distinction being drawn between the foreign and the native-born. I think that a table showing this could be made out from the Massachusetts registration reports, and regret that it is impossible for me to give the time necessary for its preparation.

Regretting that my demand on your space is so great, but promising to ask no more in connection with this subject, I remain,

Yours very truly,

FRED'K C. SHATTUCK, M.D.

BOSTON, January 8, 1886.

REALISM AND IDEALISM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have followed with great attention the discussion of realism and idealism. May I enter a protest against the meaning which Mr. Kenyon Cox in his interesting letter desires to give to the word naturalism? It is not that I do not accept Mr. Cox's distinction between realism, idealism, and naturalism: what I wish to protest against is the use of the word naturalism in the sense he uses it, because it would lead to confusion. The French, who are our masters in the fine art of criticism, whether of life or of literature or of art, and who have most carefully elaborated the terminology of criticism, have already adopted the word naturalism as meaning, in brief, ultra-realism. As romanticism is the revolt against classicism, so naturalism is the pushing still further of realism. Racine and Voltaire were classicists; Hugo and old Dumas were romanticists; M. Augier and M. Dumas, *fils*, are realists; M. Daudet and M. Zola are naturalists. And M. Zola has set forth the theory and practice of naturalism in many heavy tomes of polemic criticism and of solidly constructed fiction. Cannot Mr. Kenyon Cox call his naturalism—a very different thing from M. Zola's—by another name?

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

NEW YORK, 121 East 18th Street.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The very interesting discussion by Mr. Stillman in the *Nation* of December 31 of Realism versus Idealism scarcely disguises Mr. Stillman's partisanship of the idealistic school. The extraordinary phase of contemporary art known as realism or naturalism seems to Mr. Stillman sufficiently explained as a result of deficient imaginative power. I cannot venture to meet Mr. Stillman on his own ground of plastic art, or to broach a discussion as to the amount of imaginative faculty evident in the realistic painting and sculpture of our day, *e. g.*, in the French school of realistic painting; but the explanation which Mr. Stillman offers scarcely applies to the department of art in which the realistic theory has been most extensively popularized—I mean in fiction, especially novel-writing.

Mr. Stillman, indeed, seems almost to regard realism as an essential feature of modern fiction; but few critics would deny a distinction, not merely of degree but of fundamental conception, between the fiction of Thackeray or Hawthorne or George Eliot on the one hand, and that of Balzac, of Zola, of Alphonse Daudet, or of Tolstoi, on the other, far transcending the differences between any two members of either group. Balzac's work would probably be generally accepted as a typical example of realistic fiction, but it is scarcely conceivable that any one should deny to Balzac exuberant creative power, and few would deny a high degree of the same endowment to Balzac's more distinguished pupils, although the imagination displayed by these writers differs in kind, or, let us say, in direction, from that of another school. The realistic delineation of character and life cannot be regarded as merely mnemonic or objective any more than that of Shakspere or Thackeray or Hawthorne. Who would venture to assert that Balzac could possibly have known by actual experience a tithe of the characters and situations that he exhibits, or could have conceived them otherwise than by the imaginative intuition of genius? Nor can it be said of the masters of realistic fiction that they only see in their *dramatis personæ* what others might see in living personages, or that they merely "record external behavior and appearance." On the contrary, they conceive clearly the springs of being in their creations, and grasp well the unity of each moral nature; but they do not exclude, and in fact, give great prominence to, much that the idealistic school would regard as accidental, and appropriate only to the lower forms of comedy or to purely sensational fiction, such as the merely fortuitous occurrences of life, all manner of catastrophes and events not springing from the action of the characters or the moral principles involved in the story, the purely material surroundings of the personages, etc. What the idealistic school would regard as the mere frame or background of a romance, the realistic school raises to coördinate importance with the moral action. In this respect, Mr. Stillman's distinction between the idealistic and realistic tendencies cannot be controverted.

If, however, it be granted that realism in fiction is not due to a paucity of imaginative power, the introduction of the purely physical and fortuitous which characterizes it must be explained by some novel conviction or need felt by the writers of the realistic school—some fresh phase of human experience to which one group of minds may be more sensitive than another. It is my own belief that realism, in fiction at least, is due to the rapid disappearance of faith in a Divine government of the universe controlling human affairs as a beneficent Providence. Surely no experience could be more likely to leave its trace upon the art of any period than the transition, which a vast proportion of thoughtful persons of our own century have known, from trust in a moral order pervading human destiny to a recognition of the eternal antagonism of inhuman, irrational natural force. Now the novel is essentially a form of drama; and in all drama above low comedy the interest of the plot is based upon some conflict, whether of human emotion and will in antagonism with some supernatural power, as is usually the case in Greek drama, or of the will and passions of an individual or individuals pitted against another group of characters or against some moral principle or social prejudice, as in modern drama. When, however, all gods, Pagan or Christian, are dethroned, and we have recognized how infinitesimal is the domain of human science and moral law as compared with the outlying region of occult force, a far sublimer theme for drama offers itself in the desperate conflict of man with elemental nature, with the purely physical impulses of his own organism, with the fortuitous complications of human intercourse, with all that excludes and defies rational insight and rational volition. This antithesis of man's moral being to blind nature or chance seems to me the keynote of realistic fiction.

In idealistic literature the purely fortuitous scarcely appears; the occurrences of the drama are represented as results of some supernatural agency or moral law, and the narrative is pervaded by belief in the ascendency of mind, divine or human, over matter. Vice itself receives a certain moral character from the underlying conception of free-will. In realistic fiction life is shaped by the mysterious workings of heredity, the iron link of cause and effect replaces free-will, character is warped beyond recognition by the play of circumstance, and man appears not as the lord of creation, but as some pigmy in conflict with the Titans.

In fine, realism in fiction seems to me a very distinct product from realism in landscape-drawing, although there is sufficient superficial analogy between the two phenomena to explain the common application of the term.

Mr. Stillman concludes his letter by asking what relation the real has to music. Did not Wagner spend his life in attempting to demonstrate that music has an essential relation to the real?

T. R.

NEW YORK, January 4, 1886.

AN ELOCUTIONARY AFFECTATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Please allow me a little space to protest against a disagreeable affectation which teachers of elocution are trying to introduce into the pronunciation of English. They insist that we shall in speaking separate *at* from *all* in *at all*, and from *any rate* in *at any rate*—whereas, in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natural utterance of any cultivated man in either England or America, *at all* is as much "one word" as *attempt* is, and *at any rate* as much "one word" as *attenuate* is.

Let any one read aloud a sentence of English—of this letter, for instance—and he will notice that we (unless we are thinking of what some one has told us is right) separate a word from the word which comes after it only when the sense or ease of utterance is the cause of such a separation. In any sentence whatever of considerable length, many more words are joined to their fellows than are separated from them.

Now there can be no closer connection in sense than between a preposition (*e. g.*, *at*) and its object (*e. g.*, *all*), nor any succession of syllables easier to utter than an unaccented one ending in a consonant (*e. g.*, *at*) and an accented one beginning with a vowel (*e. g.*, *all*). It is true, we speak of a man's "running his words together so you can't understand him," but this is when he runs them together in unnatural groups, or it may mean merely that he speaks too fast and indistinctly. R. L.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 4, 1886.

"A.B." AT WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On p. 8 of this week's *Nation* your Boston correspondent gives a list of colleges where a knowledge of Greek is not required for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. To this list Washington and Lee University should be added. The only academic degrees offered by this institution are A.B., M.A., and Ph.D., there being several schemes of study for each of these degrees. In one of the schemes for A.B., only one of the two languages, Latin and Greek, is required, and only a partial course of that one.

Yours truly,

S. T. MORELAND.

W. AND L. UNIVERSITY, January 9, 1886.

Notes.

CASSELL & Co. will directly begin publication of "Cassell's National Library," a series of reprints, issued weekly under the editorship of Professor Henry Morley, which "will represent all periods and forms of thought." The first volume will be Macaulay's 'Warren Hastings.' White's 'Selborne,' Hallam's 'Middle Ages,' Franklin's Autobiography, Luther's 'Table-Talk,' Byron's 'Childe Harold,' are other works named in the prospectus. The volumes will be octavo, of about 192 pages, and will be sold for ten cents each, or $5.00 by the year—a cheapness hardly to be matched on such a scale.

Scribner & Co. announce for the present month Lieutenant Greely's narrative of the Franklin Bay expedition, in two volumes octavo, under the title, 'Three Years of Arctic Service,' and with more than a hundred engravings and maps.

For this month, too, is set down the appearance of D. H. Montgomery's 'Leading Facts of English History,' and Prof. P. V. N. Myers's 'Mediæval and Modern History'; and for June of Esyenbach's German Grammar, revised by William C. Collar, head master of the Roxbury Latin School (Ginn & Co.).

Houghton, Mifflin & Co. announce for immediate publication a volume entitled 'Progressive Orthodoxy,' made up of the editorial articles on this subject which have appeared in recent numbers of the *Andover Review*.

Mr. Howard Seely, a recent graduate of Yale, and author of 'A Lone-Star Bo-peep, and Other Texan Ranch Tales,' published by himself, has prepared a new edition, with additional tales, to which Dodd, Mead & Co. will give their imprint. The work will appear shortly.

William S. Gottsberger will publish this week Count Leo Tolstoi's historical novel, 'War and Peace,' translated from the French by Clara Bell, in two volumes.

The *Forest and Stream* Publishing Company will issue a third and enlarged edition of W. P. Stephens's 'Canoe and Boat Building.'

Henry Holt & Co. will be the American publishers of Sir Henry Maine's 'Popular Government,' and of 'The Father's Tragedy,' and other poetic dramas, by Michael Field; also, of Zeller's 'Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy,' translated by Sarah Frances Alleyne and Evelyn Abbott.

W. A. Croffut is preparing an illustrated history of the Vanderbilt Family, to be ready in May.

The Messrs. Goldsmid, of Edinburgh, are to print in their "Collectanea Adamantea" an unabridged translation of 'Manon Lescaut.' That so expensively issued during the holidays by the Messrs. Routledge, a correspondent informs us, was probably made by D. C. Mozlan, and was first published by Joseph Thomas in 1841.

We learn that seven essays have been received in competition for the Naval Institute Prize for 1886, the theme being: "What changes in organization and drill are necessary to sail and fight our war-ships of the latest type?" The best essay receives $100, a gold medal, and life-membership in the Institute. The subject of the essay for 1887 is: "The Naval Brigade: its Organization, Equipment, and Tactics." The signatures must be mottoes, and the essays be handed in by January 1, 1887.

We have received the January issue (No. 1 of vol. 1) of *Lend a Hand*, a magazine published at No. 3 Hamilton Place, Boston, as a sort of clearing-house for societies and individuals "engaged in public improvement" "on different lines of philanthropy"—in other words, an organ of associated charities. As may be inferred from the title, the Rev. E. E. Hale is at the head of the literary part of the enterprise.

The first number of the *Philanthropist*, also, is before us, an eight-page paper published monthly in this city for the promotion of social purity. Mr. and Mrs. Aaron M. Powell are the editors.

Robert Clarke & Co. have brought out a second edition of Mr. Appleton Morgan's 'The Shakespearian Myth.' The author adds a new preface, correcting himself on two points in the former edition, and referring to "the very great elaboration the Baconian theory has [meantime] received . . . at the hands of Mrs. Henry Pott, Mr. Ignatius Donnelly, and others." "Elaboration" is a neutral word, but we fancy that Mr. Morgan implies by it something different from the *reductio ad absurdum* which the works named have actually wrought on the theory.

Ginn & Co. have added to their "Classics for Children" Ruskin's 'King of the Golden River,' with Doyle's illustrations indifferently printed; 'Æsop's Fables,' edited by J. H. Stickney, with cuts and a supplement containing some of Elizur Wright's translations from La Fontaine, and specimens of Kriloff's Russian fables; and Scott's 'Talisman,' edited by Dwight Holbrook, who annotates without abridging the text.

The new edition of Marryat's 'Masterman Ready,' issued by Frederick Warne & Co., makes a square volume of 334 pages in clear print. The "original illustrations" are plentiful, but of uneven merit, and at best not to be praised highly. The present generation will, we doubt not, take kindly to this book as did its predecessors; but writers for the young have meantime made a vast stride forward in the naturalness of their conversations as compared with Marryat's example in this work.

Apparently it is customary to make an annual printed volume of the vetoes of the Governor of Pennsylvania, and that containing Governor Pattison's objections to the legislation of 1885 fills 229 pages octavo. The vetoes number 90 in all, but some simply annul items of appropriation bills. Characteristic slipshod law-making is revealed in Veto 61, in which the Governor says: "This bill and its title do not correspond. The title misrecites the enactments of the bill. Moreover, the title itself is inaccurate, and refers to an act that has no existence." There is much food for reflection in these pages, the moral of which is not simply local.

Mr. Griswold's General Index to the *Nation* (vols. 31–40), already announced, occupies thirty-two pages. The somewhat more closely set Index to vols. 1–30 filled forty-two pages. Bound together, the two will be found very convenient for reference. The price of the new Index is $1.25.

Mr. J. H. Hickcox's excellent Monthly Catalogue of U. S. Government Publications will complete its first volume during the present month. With No. 9 a new and useful feature was introduced of briefly indicating the chief issues of the month. The same number contained a list of the Signal Service Professional Papers, while No. 10 gave a list of the Professional Papers of the Corps of Engineers. We notice that the *Publishers' Weekly* has abandoned its own list of Government publications in favor of Mr. Hickcox.

Mr. Ernest Ingersoll has prepared a little handbook to the National Museum at Washington (Brentano), very well calculated for popular instruction, and furnished with numerous engravings. It is general in its description of the several departments and collections, and there is no reference to room or case or object numbers. It would seem as if the Museum were used to some extent by dealers to advertise their wares, under the guise of a loan exhibit.

The chief item of interest in the Fourth Annual Report of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens concerns the publication of the great mass of inscriptions gathered by Dr. J. R. S. Sterrett last summer in Asia Minor. There are no funds in the Committee's control applicable to this purpose, and outside aid must be relied upon. There will be at least five scholars in the School during the present year.

A suggestive little paper in No. 23 of the *American Journal of Philology* is Mr. P. B. Marcou's "Two Points in French Style." In tracing the shortening of the French sentence from Montaigne downwards, he found that with this author a mean sentence (out of 100 consecutive sentences) contained an average of 6.02 verbs, with Fénelon 4.48, Voltaire 3.89, Sainte Beuve 3.95, and Daudet 3.38. (The ratio of words to verbs Mr. Marcou determines to be as 6 : 1 or 7 : 1.) The other point dwelt on is the extent to which French writers, for the sake of euphony, emphasis, or piquancy, put the adjective before the noun instead of in its regular place after it. Rousseau uses this license freely; Chateaubriand less so, but with manifest discrimination.

"A Constant Reader" thinks it would be a favor to others holding similar views on the tariff with himself to know of the active free-trade weekly paper called the *Million*, published at a cheap rate at Des Moines, Iowa. We cheerfully name it and recommend it. Its contributors include the principal tariff reformers of the country. Nor should we omit mention of the *Freeman*, a kindred periodical published at Indianapolis—"an independent political journal, devoted to the advancement of honest politics, civil-service and tariff reform." Both these papers are conducted in the region most necessary to enlighten,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for it is now true, and will be for some time, that in the Government of this country the West is in the saddle.

From Mr. Christern we have prospectuses of several significant works: 'Anvers et l'Exposition Universelle de 1885,' by René Corneli, a fine folio souvenir of Antwerp's notable exhibition, with full-page and other illustrations, to be published in twenty parts; Jacob Falke's 'Hellas,' freely done into modern Greek by N. G. Politou, with all the illustrations; a critical edition of the 'Lusiad,' in commemoration of the tercentenary of Camoens's death ('Os Lusiadas,' Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient), with many illustrations on copper and in color; and 'Handbuch des Getreidebaues,' by Fr. Koernicke and H. Werner, the first comprehensive work in German on grain-growing.

Some idea of the disestablishment literature called out by the English elections can be gained by the list of the titles of eighty-two pamphlets and sermons on the subject received by the *Guardian* up to November 25, 1885. This list, judging from the titles, represents apparently only the Church side of the question.

The latest additions to East African literature are G. Rohlf's 'On the Climatology and Hygiene of East Africa,' and the first volume of Cardinal Massaia's account of his more than thirty years of missionary work in that country. In this volume he treats at length of the condition of the Orthodox and Coptic Churches. It may be added that the Italian interest in East Africa, as shown by the various exploring expeditions recently sent out, is largely owing to the labors of Cardinal Massaia.

'Schmidt und Smith, Hottentottisches Blaubuch,' by C. M. Seyppel, is worthy of note simply as a sign of the times. A German and an Englishman, after various burlesque adventures, are taken prisoners by the Hottentots, and before being eaten are allowed to plead for their lives. Smith accordingly sets forth in glowing terms the advantages of being annexed to Great Britain, but meets with no favor, the mention of the Queen being received with shouts of derision at the idea of being ruled by a woman. Schmidt, on the other hand, with a few words ending with a promise of Bismarck's protection, gains the submission of the savages, and immediately proceeds to tie the German flag to the top of a neighboring palm, while Smith retires discomfited. A few years ago such a book would have been impossible.

There was in the life and character of Karl Richard Lepsius, whom learned Germany, many years before his death in July, 1884, distinguished by the designation *Altmeister der Ægyptologie*, much that could be worthily depicted only by the hand of a biographer skilled in describing sentiment, energy, and active achievement. At the same time, his biography had to be written by an adept in his science, a first-class Egyptologist. Fortunately for the many admirers of the lamented scholar, and particularly for those to whom the information concerning his investigations and discoveries, as a student and travelling explorer, had to be offered in a popular manner, the task has been undertaken and executed by Georg Ebers, a writer equally famous as a romantic delineator of psychological traits and situations and as an Egyptian archæologist. His biographical memorial—the work, in part, of a disciple's gratitude—forms a volume of 400 pages, entitled 'Richard Lepsius: ein Lebensbild' (Leipzig, 1885). It will be welcome to a large circle of readers.

The "Wiener Neudrucke," a collection of reprints in which it is intended to include inexpensive reproductions of the most important and rare works which have been published in Austria from the Middle Ages to the beginning of the present century, now comprises eight volumes. Among the latest additions to the series is Stranitzky's 'Lustige Reyss-Beschreibung in verschiedene Länder,' edited by R. M. Werner from a copy in the Royal Library at Berlin, having neither date nor place of imprint. The editor gives valuable bibliographical details regarding the various editions of this work, which appears to be a satire upon the romances of travel so much in vogue in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Works relating to the development of the drama in the theatres of Vienna, and those written in the dialect of Vienna, or treating of the history of the city, also find places in the collection. Future issues will include Abraham-a-Sancta-Clara's 'Mercks Wien,' Brunner's 'Jacob und seine Soehne,' Collin's 'Lieder für die oesterreichische Landwehr,' etc.

—Whether as ex-ruler or as soldier, the name of Grant easily heads the list of the famous dead of 1885. Indeed, considering the sale of his posthumous memoirs, he is not far from leading the popular authors who have passed away. Yet in this particular he must reckon not only with Victor Hugo and Asbjörnsen, but with "Josh Billings," and even (such is the bedfellowship of literature) with T. S. Arthur. The military list thus initiated is brilliant, and recalls many of the greatest campaigns of the century: McClellan, McDowell, and J. W. Phelps in this country; Prince Frederick Charles, Manteuffel, and Vogel von Falckenstein in Germany; Serrano in Spain; the French Admiral Courbet; the ill-fated Chinese and Sudanese Gordon, and the all-conquering Mahdi. The featureless Alfonso of Spain is the only reigning sovereign of any prominence who died last year. All the American statesmen were second-rate—Colfax, Frelinghuysen, Hendricks, Gratz Brown, Robert Toombs; and of a far higher grade were Charles Rogier of Belgium, Terenzio Mamiani, Rudolph Gneist, and Holland's great though still youthful jurist, Modderman. Pascal Duprat, that good fighter of the Second Empire, is also remembered as a littérateur, though his light pales before Hugo's or Edmond About's. Of their class, in various degrees, were N. I. Kostomaroff, the Russian historian, J. P. Jacobsen, the promising Danish novelist, the Austrian poet and novelist, Alfred Meissner; Walter von Goethe, last of the name; Bishop Wordsworth, the nephew and biographer of the poet; Lord Houghton, F. J. Fargus ("Hugh Conway"), Helen Jackson ("H. H."), Richard Grant White, and Susan Warner, author of 'The Wide, Wide World.' Scholars like Georg Curtius and H. A. J. Munro would adorn any necrology; and William Veitch and Samuel Birch also deserve mention here. The librarian and biographer and benefactor of students, John Langdon Sibley, and that bookish bookseller and publisher, Charles Welford, may fitly be named in the same connection. Science loses the zoölogists Henri Milne Edwards, John Gwyn Jeffreys, and William B. Carpenter; a great archæologist in Worsaae; an interesting student of ethnology in Eugène Bodichon; the explorers, Gustav Nachtigal and Robert von Schlagintweit; the chemist, Benjamin Silliman. Three eminent civil engineers, Dupuy de Lôme, John B. Jervis, and Commander Gorringe; and a remarkable inventor, with the sad lot of his demon-haunted class, W. B. Woodbury, to whom we owe so many useful applications of photography, conclude the present division.

—Besides Modderman and Gneist, the law reckons comparatively few losses, and mention of Lord Cairns in England and John Norton Pomeroy in this country will suffice. Eminent as clergymen or theologians were Cardinal McCabe, Archbishop McCloskey, Bishop Fraser of Manchester, J. H. Scholten, and Daniel Schenkel. Three conspicuous figures—one indispensable—in our great religious agitation for the abolition of slavery, Maria W. Chapman, Elizur Wright, and Orson S. Murray, diminished the ranks of the veteran survivors in 1885; and Lord Shaftesbury's is the most significant name among the other philanthropists who have ceased from their labors. Paris honors DeLiesville, who gave back to the public his priceless antiquarian collection. A princely philanthropist was missed in W. H. Vanderbilt, whose maximum distinction is his inherited riches. The causing of wealth in others is the fame of James Marshall, the discoverer of gold in California. A. de Neuville and William Page among painters; Franz Abt, Ferdinand Hiller, Sir Julius Benedict, and Leopold Damrosch among musicians, are art's contributions to the list of the departed; and those who for fifty years have sung the familiar hymn "Federal Street" will perhaps wish to associate with the foregoing its unpretentious composer, the late Henry K. Oliver, of Massachusetts.

—The Perkins Institution for the Blind, at South Boston, Mass., has been making a very promising experiment in the introduction of the kindergarten system for the younger scholars, and the results have already been remarkable. Pupils who were sinking gradually into sluggishness and idiocy, averse even to locomotion, and unable so much as to tie the strings of their shoes, have been reclaimed, and have made remarkable progress. Boys and girls who seemed entirely helpless, and had no command whatever of their hands, have been aroused to energy and activity through its ministry. And last summer the enthusiastic Director, Mr. Anagnos, gave a pathetic and most interesting exhibition, in which the little pupils in physiology showed their understanding of their lessons by modelling the heart and other organs; baby botanists made plants; tiny geographers shaped maps; and some little boys who had gotten into zoölogy moulded turtles, polyps on the coral reefs, etc. There is no other field where the stimulus of Froebel's object lessons is so needed to keep the minds of the poor sightless little ones from the hopeless stagnation caused by the want of stimulants to thought and action such as their eyes furnish their more fortunate brothers and sisters. The Perkins Institution is not able to establish this preparatory department within its walls, but a new building has been erected, and it is hoped that funds can be obtained to put the new juvenile department speedily in operation.

—The movement for the abolition of compulsory prayers at Harvard has recommenced among the students in earnest, with an organization which means, we hope, permanence until the end is attained, and with an admirable statement of reasons. It is not surprising to find the *Unitarian Review* opposed to this "revival," which it pronounces "an insult to the memory of the religious founder of this institution"—in refreshing disregard of the holy horror with which John Harvard would have looked upon the Unitarian tenets of the editor and his affected solicitude "Christo et ecclesiæ." Nor can cant much further go than when it is declared incredible that signatures should have been largely obtained for this self-evident truth: "That voluntary attendance upon prayers would necessarily betoken genuine interest in the religious exercises"; and this truth of experience, "That the sense of compulsion accompanying the present attendance upon prayers is not conducive to the development of sincere religious feeling, but, on the contrary, produces indifference, if not hostility, to the observance." The fact is, that if we may force a man to prayers, we may force him to church, and we cannot now think of anything more useful for the editor of the *Review* than a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compulsory course of attendance on ultra-Calvinistic preaching. His plan for finally suppressing the agitation is as amusing as anything that goes before. He would have the President and all the members of the Faculty make it a duty to attend prayers regularly. It is, however, well known that a majority of the Faculty are in hearty sympathy with the anti-compulsory movement. Among these are professors whose orthodoxy, unlike the *Review* editor's, is above reproach, and who would, as a sign of their respect for religion and abhorrence of the present system, rather absent themselves from prayers persistently than attend in order to discourage the feeling of revolt.

—The *Rundschau* for December contains two interesting addresses by the famous historian Von Sybel, upon the education of women. The first was delivered in October, 1883, as the opening address in the Victoria Lyceum, an institution which can perhaps be best described for Americans by calling it the Berlin Annex. The address is chiefly a memorial tribute to Miss Archer, the founder of the Lyceum, who died at Montreux in 1882. But few biographical details are given. We learn that Miss Archer received but a slender education in the home of her parents, and that she grew up under circumstances which offered little gratification to her natural thirst for knowledge, and only a meagre scope for her energetic character. To achieve her own mental independence, she determined to go to Germany. There she first attended a school in Lüneburg, and then went to Berlin and commenced giving lessons in English. As a teacher she was immediately successful, but the greater her success and the more clearly she became conscious of her own intellectual needs, the more she pondered upon the badness of the situation as regarded the higher education of women. As her pupils opened their hearts to her, she found many of them to be in a condition of mental apathy. Others impressed her with the superficiality of their attainments, and even the most ambitious seemed to be unable to help themselves to further acquirements. The graduates of the *Töchterschule* had no means of further culture except in the way of private reading, and for this they lacked direction and had not learned how to direct themselves; and so it was no wonder that so many of them lapsed into an "empty and frivolous existence." Meditating constantly upon this condition of affairs, Miss Archer became possessed of a desire to remedy it if possible. What to do, however, was not easy to decide. She had neither the means nor the influence requisite for the founding of a university or even a gymnasium for women; so she decided to avail herself of the fashionable appetite for popular lectures. She projected a lecture institute, and succeeded in winning for her plan the interest of the Prussian Crown Princess, who lent to the enterprise her name and her sanction. In 1869 the Lyceum began its work with four courses of lectures and seventy students. But Miss Archer soon observed that the listeners were not, as a rule, ready for the academic pabulum which was offered them. The word "langeweilig" came often from their lips, and many were evidently using the courses of the Lyceum simply as a diversion. She saw that classes for disciplinary work must be established. As to the studies best adapted to this purpose, she did not hesitate: nothing could take the place of mathematics, Greek, and Latin—the Latin grammar being, in her judgment, peculiarly fitted to develop that *Ordnungssinn* so essential in women. Such classes were accordingly provided, and the Lyceum prospered. Pecuniary aid soon came from private sources, then from the city of Berlin, and lastly from the Prussian Government. In 1883 the Lyceum offered twenty-seven lecture courses, with about the same number of classes for drill work, and had 900 students. In 1885 this last number had increased to 1,200. So successful has the Berlin establishment become, that it has been imitated in various other German cities.

— Von Sybel's second address, delivered at the opening of the Lyceum last October, is devoted to a general consideration of the woman question from the German point of view and in its educational aspect. There is little in it that will sound new upon this side of the Atlantic, for notoriously we have not very much to learn from Germany with regard to the education of women. The speaker's attitude is conservative. He is in favor of allowing women to learn whatever they like, so it only be appropriate to them; but he is also in favor of denying them the best, the most natural, and the most efficacious means of satisfying their craving for knowledge, namely, free access to the universities. He touches upon the familiar question whether women should study the same things that men study, and finds himself compelled to raise a voice of warning. Experience shows, he says, that the range of higher study which is suitable for women is a limited one. A female lawyer, politician, philosopher, or even theologian is a monstrosity, although in medicine, history, art, literature, and—botany, woman is quite in her place. The inference from this would appear to be that in this second set of subjects, at least, women should have, if they want it, the best instruction attainable, and that is presumably to be found at the universities. This disagreeable conclusion is, however, ingeniously evaded by Von Sybel. He observes that a boy requires all the time from his tenth to his twenty-fifth year to fit himself for a learned career, and that such a long period of study is for women, who have so much else to do (housework presumably), simply out of the question. An argument of this sort shows how deeply rooted in the German mind is the idea that the so-called philosophical studies of the university have no theoretical *raison d'être* except as a preparation for teaching. It seems not to occur to Von Sybel that a young woman of brains might wish to hear university lectures, say upon art, or upon botany, without intending to make herself a rival of Lübke or of Sachs. The remainder of the address is devoted to advice. It closes with a long quotation from the last chapter of Proverbs.

—"For two years and a half," says Élisée Reclus in his Preface to his friend Kropotkin's 'Paroles d'un révolté' (Paris, 1885; New York: F. W. Christern), "Peter Kropotkin has been in prison, cut off from the society of his fellow-men. His punishment is hard, but the silence imposed upon him regarding the subjects most dear to his heart is quite differently painful; his confinement would be less oppressive if he were not gagged." To a man so overflowing with sentiments tender or fiery; with love and sympathy for toiling mankind, and hatred and dread of rulers, employers, and possessors; with harrowing pessimism as to the present of society in all its forms and aspects, and with the brightest Messianic hopes, based on altruism, socialism, and "the commune"; with glowing or scathing words and phrases, imbibed from prophets and apostles, Jacobins and Nihilists—from Isaiah down to Tchernyshevski—to such a man enforced silence must indeed be the last of martyrdoms. This martyrdom must yet last for years unless abridged by the clemency of the President. Meantime, "what commonplaces," Reclus exclaims, "are we going to be treated to, what lying utterances are to wound us, what selfish half-truths are to be drummed into our ears?" To counteract these emanations of *bourgeois* egoism the famous French geographer and anarchist has collected, annotated, and published in book form the articles contributed some years ago to the journal *Le Révolté* by his Russian co-worker in the dissemination of geographical science and anarchic principles. The book is a perfect gospel of salvation, which is to come after the necessary demolition, by the tawny arms of laborers, of thrones, altars, and magisterial benches, of villas, banks, and private workshops. The revolution is coming—bloody and terrific—and with it an everlasting reign of altruism and Arcadian bliss. The Jews who saw the walls of Jericho totter, the Crusaders who stormed the ramparts of Jerusalem, were not half so convinced of the unmixed happiness they were bringing to the Holy Land as the bearers of the ark of anarchism and crusaders of "the commune" are of the felicity which is to dawn on all mankind as soon as the Bastile of individual property is breached. Till then, Prince Kropotkin tells us in his inexhaustible eloquence, everything is hell—politically, economically, physically, morally; afterwards, everything is paradise—sloth, envy, passion, mendacity, rapacity, and the like vanishing like nightmares. With such clear visions of what is coming, life in a dungeon must be sweet. Isaiah had similar visions when he prophesied of the wolf and the lamb dwelling together and the lion eating straw like the ox—but he seems to have prophesied of distant times.

—In speaking of the opening performance of the American Opera Company we called attention to the fact that the word American, in this connection, could only be taken in the sense of international, so far as the operas to be performed are concerned. The second opera produced by this company, on Friday evening, is in itself a curious illustration of the tendency to become international which music has always had. Gluck's "Orpheus and Eurydice" is practically an Italian opera by a German composer, which has been revised in a French spirit, and was sung at the Academy of Music in the English language by American singers. Gluck wrote this opera with an Italian libretto for Vienna, where it was produced in 1762 with great success. Twelve years later, when it was to be brought out at Paris, he added several excellent numbers, but arranged the part of *Orpheus*, which had been assigned originally to a male alto, for a high tenor. As this change did not improve the effect, Berlioz took occasion in 1859 to restore the original alto part, assigning it to Mme. Viardot Garcia; and in this form it produced, as Berlioz tells us, one of the greatest successes he had ever witnessed. Mr. Thomas followed the precedent of Berlioz, and not only for this, but for enabling American audiences for the first time really to appreciate this work through an adequate performance, he deserves the gratitude of all lovers of classical music. So far as his share of the interpretation was concerned the performance was absolute perfection. The orchestra played with a delicacy and a refinement of shading that cannot be too much commended, and in the choruses one could not admire sufficiently the sensuous beauty of tone that seems to be characteristic of American choral bodies, whatever may be said of the harshness of voice of individual American women.

—As for Gluck's opera—the revival of which comes opportunely within one year of the centenary of Gluck's death—it must be admitted that some parts of it are thin and antiquated, and can only be enjoyed if we put the historic spectacles over the mind's eye. For the sake of the second act, however, and some other numbers, this opera will always be revived at intervals. Considering how short is the life of operas

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

general, the fact that it is revived at all is a remarkable thing. But, as Schumann remarked of another opera of Gluck, "So long as the world exists, such music will always be revived, will never become antiquated"; and the enthusiastic Berlioz quotes Jules Janin's words, that "it is not ourselves that take up again the old master-works, but it is the master-works that take us up again." In the history of music "Orpheus" occupies a remarkable place, inasmuch as with it Gluck broke away from Italian traditions and began to embody some of those principles of the music of the future, or dramatic music, which have found their full realization in Wagner. Gluck's reforms consisted chiefly in his refusal to be a mere slave of vain *prime donne* and tenors by writing arias in which musical worth was subordinated to the necessity of giving the singer a chance to display vocal agility. Gluck accordingly pruned his melodies of all superfluous ornamentation, and tried to restore harmony between the contents of the text and the expression of the music. Further than this, however, his reforms did not go, and the detractors of Wagner who formerly insisted that he merely carried out Gluck's ideas and reforms, only betrayed their woful ignorance of the history of music, their lack of insight. Gluck retained all the old operatic disconnected forms of aria, duo, ballet, etc., while Wagner substituted in the place of these disjointed numbers a continuous orchestral undercurrent sustaining the vocal melody and declamation; and besides this he introduced, in his system of ever-recurring leading motives which characterize each person and dramatic idea of the plot, a principle of which Gluck never dreamed, and which for the first time made music really capable of telling a story in its own language.

NEWCOMB'S POLITICAL ECONOMY.

Principles of Political Economy. By Simon Newcomb, Ph.D., LL.D. Harper & Brothers.

THIS book was written with a view to making political economy less controversial and more practical. The author holds that the strictly *a priori* method and the historical method are both alike defective; that the true method lies in a union of the two. Like every other science, political economy is partly "pure" and partly applied. Like every other science, it must rely on practical research rather than on abstract reasoning; but the research, in order to be fruitful, must arrange and interpret its results in accordance with logical principles. Thus the abstract and the practical sides must help each other. The author's aim in the book before us was to give an exposition, in scientific form, of the principles of economic science as to which all who understand the subject are in substantial agreement. He would exclude from pure political economy all mere views, and, as far as possible, all doubtful or controverted doctrine, relegating such matters to the field of investigation.

His view as to the place and function of general principles in the science leads him to endeavor to state and develop them in the form best suited to the use of observers and investigators. Other economists try to show the working of economic laws under the simplest conditions. They make much of the individual, and avoid all unnecessary complications. They carry the student far from the madding crowd, to a region where wages are paid in kind and commodity is exchanged for commodity by barter. Professor Newcomb, on the other hand, treats matters from the standpoint of actual affairs. He leads his reader into the haunts of active business, and speaks to him the language of the shop and the counting-room. In his book, as in the great world of business, trade occupies a more prominent place than production, and the medium of exchange is at least as much thought of as the things exchanged. Men produce only to sell, and sell only for money. The action of economic forces is traced by their effect on the flow of money to and from individuals and classes. Changes in the flow are treated as the source of far-reaching economic effects. Where other books speak of value, this one speaks of prices. Where other books speak of saving capital and lending capital, this one speaks of saving and lending money. Most of the author's reasonings about wages, profits, supply and demand, cost of production, etc., are conducted in terms of the cash account, and embrace all the complications of the industrial system. His aim being to make his readers intelligent observers, he naturally brings them face to face with the actual things to be observed.

This method has some obvious advantages. It has the great advantage of seeming reality. Practical men might, perhaps, be ready to accept, when presented in that way, doctrines which they reject when presented in the old way. And since the practical man shows no sign of coming to political economy, it would surely be a great blessing if political economy could come to the practical man. Also, if it should be found possible to diminish controversy, and to bring professed economists more into the attitude of friendly coöperation, much good would certainly accrue to the influence of their science on the conduct of affairs. If Professor Newcomb's book should contribute even a little toward so desirable results, we should all be greatly his debtors. On the other hand, we must not allow the agreeable prospect to blind us to the great dangers of his method. Daily familiarity with money and the ways and phrases of practical life makes it seem easy and natural to use them in economic reasoning. But unfortunately, when so used, they are apt to play tricks. Money, especially, seems to have no end of deceits. It belongs to the surface of the subject, not to its depths. The man who uses it as a vehicle for his reasonings about fundamental principles must scan warily every step he takes, or it will lead him into confusion and fallacy, cheating him with reasons that prove nothing, and explanations that do not explain.

For examples of these dangers, we regret to say that one need not travel outside of Professor Newcomb's own book. He is a Malthusian. He also sees clearly that the wages of labor must be paid out of capital. Yet we have not found in his book any statement of the law of wages. He has much to say about *changes* of wages, but seems to regard the average rate as a thing not needing to be accounted for. He even at times uses expressions at variance with the law of wages, as when (p. 400) he avers that increase of population without increase of capital would cause higher prices; or when (p. 403) he speaks of a general fall of prices as the result of an increase of capital. Without a law of wages, a satisfactory law of profits is of course impossible. Professor Newcomb, however, undertakes to explain the source and rate of profits independently of wages. This he does by drawing attention to the labor-saving power of machinery, railways, etc. He defines capital as a labor-saving agent; the saving belongs to the capitalist and determines his profit (p. 89). Seeing clearly that circulating capital has no power to save labor, he endeavors to account for the profit it yields by observing that, if it yielded none, there would be no circulating capital; and that abstinence is itself "something which can command money in the public market." But he fails to consider that *all* capital is originally circulating capital, and can be turned into machinery only by being paid to laborers. Profits, then, must obviously start from wages as a base, even on his own theory. But the theory that attributes to capital, as capital, a labor-saving power, does not bear examination. Capital, as such, is merely savings—resources for the support of industry. The labor-saving devices we owe primarily to those who invented them. Of course capital is necessary in order to make use of inventions; but to call capital itself "a labor-saving contrivance" is the same as to call pig-iron a steam-engine. Further, the author himself, in his chapter on the "effect of labor-saving improvements," shows very clearly that the benefit of the saving brought about by machinery goes to the consumer and not to the capitalist.

Cost of production he defines as consisting of wages, interest, taxes, etc., all expressed in money. This definition has long since been shown to have the great defect of confounding the cost of producing a thing with the rewards of the producers. It leads to much confusion and difficulty. Professor Newcomb himself finds it necessary to make so much abatement and correction (p. 257 *et seq.*) that it may be doubted whether ordinary readers will see clearly what "net cost of production" really stands for, or what it would be good for if anybody could discover it, which is confessedly impossible. The net cost of production of a gold watch, for example, is not the sum total of the amounts actually paid for getting it made. It is rather the smallest sum that would suffice to keep the men who make it from going out of the business. So it has no control over the value, except perhaps to fix a point down to which the value cannot permanently descend.

Perhaps the most striking proof of the defects of Professor Newcomb's method is to be found in the conclusion to which it leads him regarding the connection between demand for commodities and demand for labor. Reasoning on the flow of money from man to man, he concludes that when a person has money to spend, it makes no difference to the laboring class whether he spends it in hiring laborers or in buying commodities. For if he buys goods he thereby supplies the producer of those goods with the means and a motive for making more goods. This is an old fallacy—one of those perennial fallacies that are many times killed, but never die. We should have no hope of making any impression on it by anything we could say in this notice. But we must remark that Professor Newcomb, in his criticism of Mill's position (p. 434), seems to us to argue somewhat beside the point. Mill distinguishes two cases, first, the case of a man who has produced an article for which there is no demand. In this case a part of the circulating capital has been made useless, has practically been lost. If, now, a purchaser should step down from the moon and relieve the man of his mistake by buying his product, Mill admits that the mere fact of the purchase would affect the demand for labor. The lost capital would be restored, and could be used again in paying wages. It must be noted, however, that the sale would only restore things to the position they were in before the mistake was made. The true view of the case then would seem to be, not that the sale would create a demand for labor, but that the mistake of the producer has destroyed a part of the demand. Further, unless we are assuming the man to be a fool, we must not assume that he would use his recovered capital in paying men for making a fresh stock of the same unsalable commodity. So that it is true only in a restricted sense that the sale in such a case would supply the means for making more goods; and it is not at all true that it would supply a motive.

The other case spoken of by Mill is the ordinary one of production in answer to demand—

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the case in which no mistake has been made. Mill assumes that ordinarily production is carried on with an intelligent eye on the market, and holds that when men buy things that were produced only because men wanted them, the buyers are merely carrying out the final stage of production by division of labor. Of course exchange must keep pace with production, otherwise the operations of capital are interfered with. But the friction of exchange ought not to hide the true nature of the case. Men use division of labor because, in spite of all the delays, risks, and trouble connected with the exchanging of products, the world gains immensely by the use of it. The greater the delays and friction, the more capital is required for carrying on a given amount of production. Quick sales are therefore beneficial. They lessen the cost of producing things and promote high wages. This we believe to be the true relation between demand for commodities and demand for labor, in the ordinary case. Those who maintain the contrary view confound the ordinary case with the case of mistaken production, and virtually assume that all production is of the mistaken kind.

The point is far from being one of merely speculative importance. Most of the false theories and mischievous legislation under which the world has suffered, and still suffers, are directly traceable to the fallacy that demand for commodities is a demand for labor. In the book before us it pervades, and to a large extent vitiates, the author's discussion of the very practical subject of taxation. Taxes, he says, take away from us money we should otherwise spend for ourselves. They therefore lessen our demand for labor, and tend, if there were no compensation, to lower wages. But the Government must spend the revenue in some form, and in whatever form it spends it, a demand for labor is set up precisely equal to the loss of demand on our part. Thus he reaches the conclusion that neither taxes nor Government loans can affect the total demand for labor, or lower wages. So that we are to believe that taxes on the active capital of the country, even taxes so heavy as to absorb the greater part of it, would not injure the laboring classes, provided only the revenue be promptly spent. It would even seem to follow that if a special tax were imposed on the laborers themselves, they would not be really burdened by it, since the Government, by spending the increase of revenue, would set up a new demand for labor, and thus raise wages by the amount of the tax. However this may be, the author seems to conclude that it matters little who pays the taxes:

"The really important question growing out of taxation is, not how the tax is to be levied, but how it is to be expended. In whatever way it is levied, it will have come out of the pockets of the community, and different classes will probably have to pay nearly the same in any case" (p. 483).

Again:

"We need scarcely fear that any tax levied according to a general law will be permanently inequitable" (p. 493).

His view is, apparently, that the tax comes out of the monetary circulation, is restored again, and in the end diffuses itself over the community.

By the same reasoning he maintains that the state could not help the poor by levying taxes to be expended for their benefit, say, in building better houses:

"If the wealthy are taxed, the money they can spend in other directions will be diminished by exactly the amount of the tax. . . . The final result would be that the cost of building the tenement houses would come out of servants, builders of locomotives, and the occupants of the houses themselves" (p. 521).

Again, as to the socialistic scheme for giving employment to the unemployed poor, he says:

"In order to pay them wages the Government must levy a tax. This tax would be taken right out of the monetary circulation, and would cause a diminution in the ability of taxpayers to employ labor exactly equal to the increase in the power of the Government to do so. Thus, at best, the injury would equal the benefit" (p. 523).

We shall make no comment on these doctrines beyond remarking that they seem to us to supply a very good *reductio ad absurdum* for the theory that demand for commodities is a demand for labor. We are still of the opinion that if every spendthrift in the country were required by law to part with half of his income for the benefit of the poor of his neighborhood, both parties to the transaction would become aware of a very substantial difference in their circumstances.

In spite of the serious defects we have pointed out, Professor Newcomb's book contains much that is excellent and highly instructive. Many of his chapters are admirable for sound doctrine and clear, incisive reasoning. In some respects it will undoubtedly be found a valuable contribution to the science. The plan, for example, of treating circulating capital as a flow rather than a fund will be found a permanent improvement. The copious questions and exercises interspersed throughout the book supply valuable food for reflection, and will be especially serviceable to teachers. As a whole, then, the work is characterized by great excellences and great defects. It reads like the work of an acute and able thinker who is continually hampered, and at times led quite astray, by a wrong method of treating his subject.

RECENT NOVELS.

Oblivion. An Episode. By M. G. McClelland. [Leisure Hour Series.] Henry Holt & Co.

White Heather. By William Black. Harper & Bros.

Suzette. By Mary Spear Tiernan. Henry Holt & Co.

Mustard Leaves, or a Glimpse of London Society. By D. T. S. Dodd, Mead & Co.

Mrs. Herndon's Income. By Helen Campbell. Boston: Roberts Bros.

THE scene of 'Oblivion' is laid "in the Appalachian Mountains," well south, but too remote from the country Miss Murfree describes to be in any way an imitation. With less of color than in her pictures, the effect is that of a strong etching. The author has forestalled comparisons by a word of preface to the effect that the story was written in entire ignorance of 'Called Back.' The resemblance between the two books is confined to the single incident of the loss of memory, and almost of all mental power, by a young and beautiful woman. Hugh Conway's story is very simple, dealing with incidents only, and never attempting to trace development of character, or to study the effect of incidents upon it. 'Oblivion' presents both, and for that reason is on a far higher plane, even if less successful within its own limits. 'Called Back' only demands the belief that anything may happen in a novel, from the basest murder to the luckiest of chance meetings, and all goes smoothly. The author of 'Oblivion,' with large confidence that betokens a brief experience, has undertaken to combine in one plot at least three different studies: first, the growth of a second life after the loss of memory; second, the effect of love for a refined and beautiful woman upon a man noble by nature but untrained and uncouth; and third, the situation when this woman recovers her memory, and the complications of the two lives present themselves for disentanglement. This last is a knot which to the author's feeling at least can only be cut violently, for the lady is at once a beloved wife and the betrothed of her chivalrous deliverer and protector, while she is dead to all her world.

Any one of these three studies would fill a book, though for ourselves, never liking the school that would turn the romance into a clinic, we find the first quite enough developed here. The second is so freshly and delicately outlined as to give it the charm of an idyl. It is the best of the book, and so touches the sympathy of the reader that the conclusion comes as a positive pain. The want of practice in making up a plot tells more than anywhere else in the tendency to make the difficulties of the situation so extreme, so inevitable, that the only way out is a violent one. It goes so far sometimes in books otherwise well written as almost to leave the impression that precious lives have been sacrificed solely to end a story. It would be easy to point out grave faults in style besides these mistakes in construction, but there is in the book such a power of imagination so bent on high things, so touched to fine issues, that we are fain to dwell on the promise of a future which shall add to present ability a trained artistic skill.

The essential part of 'White Heather' is as pretty as anything Mr. Black has ever done. He leaves the west coast, of which we had had a little too much, and transports us to the loneliest of Scotch lakes in the early days of the season for salmon-fishing, finding an opportunity for new pictures, even after all he has given us, in the brilliant air and dazzling contrasts of winter sunlight and snow. The main theme is the superiority of country life, unambitious and untroubled, over the hurried, tempted life of the great city. Old as the theme is, Mr. Black has so embodied it in fresh young lives as to make it new again. All of the book that is Scotch—be it out on moor or loch, or in Glasgow—is in perfect keeping. There is over-much of the hero's verses, for he is that sort of poet whose song is wakened only by the charms of the woman he loves. The salmon-fishing, too, is a bit over-done for any one not a sportsman. Still, in the portrayal of brisk, stirring, out-of-door life, and with it the love of ingenuous youth for gentle maidenhood, Mr. Black has now no superior. Some of his later work has, no doubt, given the impression one feels in listening to a voice that is no longer young, singing a hackneyed strain. With Mr. Black the voice may be worn, but it has always been sweet and pure, and the strain always tender and noble.

Thus much for the genuinely Scotch part of the book. There is another curious side to it, which has afforded no little amusement while the story has been coming out as a serial. The good genius of the piece is an American, or we should say genii, for the man has a daughter who is rather more important than he, since if he has the money she has the facile invention which uses it. They are not exactly caricatures, for their qualities are such that no one need be ashamed of them. It is their speech which astonishes. Even omitting the worst of it which Mr. Black represents the young girl as adopting in a kind of defiance, East, West, or South never heard the like, nor has any English writer before attempted to impose upon American lips such a fantastic jumble. The *Texas Siftings* seems to have replaced the 'Biglow Papers' in certain circles as the standard of American speech. Nobody would take the trouble to resent such misrepresentations, but their presence in fiction explains the exclamation the well-bred American is sure to hear in England sooner or later, "*You* are not an American!"

'Suzette' is not exactly a picture of Richmond in the forties, being rather a chronicle of pleasant family life. The old city, with its generous

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

homes and its traditions, fills in the edges and the corners of the canvas much after the fashion in which the garden is introduced, or the hills, in the pictures which artists describe as figures with landscape. Miss Tiernan follows very closely the method of grouping by contrasts—the lonely little heroine, almost a waif, in the chill grandeur of the great house, and the beloved daughter and sister in the bustling life of a home which affection makes glad in spite of slender means; two men, the one growing into a lonely recluse, the other frank-hearted, giving and winning confidence. The types are none of them new, but they are saved from being conventional by the freshness of the author's fancy and the ingenuity and originality of the incidents. The surroundings, too, are novel, for all Southern cities are still very remote from us, and life in them as it was forty years ago is utterly different from the hurried rush of city life to-day. A small circle, living on generation after generation without change, develops a community of interest known nowhere else. The life was certainly narrow, yet its sympathies were thereby the deeper. It is easy to call it indifferent, idle, or by a harsher term, but in it all there was a placid leisure of a charm such as survives in the pages of 'Sir Charles Grandison.'

The author is least successful with her hero, Geoffrey Amherst, for she is not equal to the delicate shading which would make a character only repelling, not repulsive. The little trio of himself, his mother, and Suzette suggests 'Nathalie,' but barely suggests it, for their story is so involved with other lives as to give far greater variety of events and situations. The telling incident which, to use a paradox, we are not told, but only what led to it and what came out of it, is the escape of a slave to freedom by the aid of Suzette. Yet the book has not the least concern with "questions" of any kind. The incident appears, as did those on the much larger scale of 'Homoselle,' simply as a part of the life men and women lived then and there. The Southampton insurrection of fifty-five years ago has more than once supplied sensational material for fiction. The distinctive merit of the use of it by Miss Tiernan in 'Homoselle' was in the penetration which looked beyond the surface facts, and rightly gauged the qualities of the negroes themselves as they then were, which made failure inevitable. The two books, in spite of all their shortcomings, their occasional trite expressions and quotations, the evident lack of literary association, the want of finish, of balance, form a notable contribution to our knowledge of the South. There is the complete absence of *parti pris*, the utter unconsciousness, which make the value of the competent witness. The only impartial testimony is the testimony which is of equal weight on either side. 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' was the fervid plea of a righteous indignation. The replies, novels all forgotten now, were only some form of angry denial. These unpretending narratives of Miss Tiernan, which tell of slavery only because the lives of the masters could not be represented without it, justify all the accusations of the abolitionists, and at the same time clearly reveal the perils, the overwhelming difficulties, of the situation of the masters themselves.

The heroine of 'Mustard Leaves' is the familiar American girl of ravishing beauty. The son of the Duke of Babylon espies her as he is about to take the stage in a White Mountain village. He forces his way into her mother's home, and, spite of his offering the girl a gross insult within the first half hour, he speedily persuades them to go to Europe. After a brief sojourn in Paris, she becomes through his efforts the success of the London season. Prevented by poverty from marrying her himself, he contrives a match for her with a millionaire baronet, meaning then to win his own base, selfish ends. She is soon broken-hearted, and, with barely strength enough left to resist the evil tempter, flees to Paris. There turns up the friend of her childhood, who had early appeared in the distance as a divinity student and a waiter at a summer hotel. He starts to take her to her mother, who has returned home. The steamer founders in mid-ocean and she is drowned in his arms. It is the international story run wild. We have sketched it, not supposing a protest would be of much use, but to show the reader what absurdities may be gravely put together as probable. "D. T. S." does not even know New England, for at the very outset a man is presented as the "'Squire" of the village, who has spent his life in the grocery store. There is cleverness enough to put together a few pages which, at a cursory glance, might pass for a picture of London fashionable life. A little scrutiny detects the counterfeit. One ready to take gloomy views of society might find unfortunately in the newspapers some evidence for the assumption that almost all the men in Mayfair are *roués*, and all the women live in an atmosphere of petty backbiting and of dubious scandal, but when it comes to manners and customs, the writer is so utterly at sea that there is no need to be distressed by any estimate of morals from such a tyro. How could any one imagine that the most angry husband would believe his wife such a fool as to make a ruinous visit to a gentleman's apartments, leaving her carriage, liveries and all, standing before his door for an hour in broad daylight? The name 'Mustard Leaves' suggests a purpose of satire, an aim that is lamentably missed, for the very good reason that no form of literary work requires such intimate knowledge of the subject as satire. There is no need to delay for further proof of the ignorance of "D. T. S." both as to scenes and characters.

Again we have to regret the crowding of many subjects, each enough to fill a whole story, between the covers of one novel. It is of the more consequence because, up to a certain point, Mrs. Campbell does her work extremely well; how well would perhaps be best shown by comparison with such a book as 'Fashion and Famine.' That deservedly dropped out of sight a generation ago, but it was a very fair specimen of the florid, romantic treatment of social questions. In 'Mrs. Herndon's Income' Mrs. Campbell has stated and partially illustrated too many of them for us to attempt even a catalogue. In the broken reading necessarily given to a newspaper serial there is time for more reflection than the novel is likely to excite, and in that form the story may have had already greater usefulness than it can again. It starts anew the question whether as realism (in the common acceptation of exactness of detail) comes to be more and more demanded of a novel, its employment as an instrument of special pleading will not be greatly limited. We are not entering upon any discussion whether it is best so or not, but simply pointing to the facts. The book before us, any one can see, is a very partial, a very imperfect statement of the wrongs and the sins it deprecates. It is not true, because the truth is a great deal worse, and because the omissions and the suppressions make what is told often inconsistent and contradictory. Yet, had Mrs. Campbell filled out the whole story, the *Christian Union* would never have printed it. 'L'Assommoir' is the most tremendous temperance story that ever was written, as accurate as it is harrowing, but it is hard to say to whom it can have done any good. The men and women it describes are not intelligent enough to come within reach of it, to be helped by its reasoning, while on higher levels most persons would say, better run the risk of ignorance than be so terribly enlightened. It will be asked: Do you then mean that with Dickens as an example to look back to, the novel cannot be made a servant in the cause of philanthropy? This question, we have already said, we are not prepared to answer. Rather, we add another: If the present tendencies continue, will they not bring us to the end of the novel for such purposes in communities that still hold the theory that purity and nobleness are best guarded when the unclean and the ignoble are, not falsely concealed, but never dragged forth for their own sake?

PINDAR.

Pindar: the Olympian and Pythian Odes. With an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes by Basil L. Gildersleeve, Professor of Greek in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Harper & Bros. 1885. 12mo, pp. cxv, 395.

ABOUT three years ago we had occasion to commend an edition of selected odes of Pindar by Prof. T. D. Seymour, of Yale College. We expressed the opinion that it was eminently adapted to the needs of undergraduates, and that for those who intended to continue the study of Pindar beyond the narrow limits to which the amount read in college is necessarily confined, it would be well to begin by reading Professor Seymour's edition as a sort of general introduction. We have as yet seen no reason to change our opinion. The present edition of the Olympian and Pythian odes, by Professor Gildersleeve, not only contains a much larger portion of the works of Pindar, but it is in all respects on a more extended scale. The introductory essay is much longer, and treats very fully a great many matters which Professor Seymour does not mention. The special introductions to the different odes are very elaborate, and contain a large amount of historical learning and refined analysis. The notes are numerous and minute, and, while perfectly intelligible to any pupil who is qualified to study Pindar at all, they will be the more fully appreciated the more advanced his scholarship is. Prof. Gildersleeve says, indeed, that "the whole book is intended for beginners in Pindar," but we suspect that the interval between beginners in Greek and the "beginners in Pindar," whom Professor Gildersleeve is accustomed to instruct, is much greater than between the beginner in Greek and the average undergraduate.

In some respects the book has been prepared under exceptionally favorable circumstances. A fellow and a scholar of the Johns Hopkins University have assisted the Professor in preparing indexes and reading proofs; "the metrical schemes are due to the generosity of Dr. J. H. Heinrich Schmidt," who kindly placed at the editor's disposal the MS. of his unpublished 'Pindar'; and graceful acknowledgment is also made of the assistance of such well-known scholars as Prof. C. D. Morris, Dr. Alfred Emerson, and of Doctor Drisler, who has the editorial supervision of "Harper's Classical Series," of which this edition of Pindar forms a part.

Professor Gildersleeve's introductory essay commences with a life of Pindar, in which he gives, with much interesting comment, the few facts that have been handed down to us. Most noticeable are the evident side-glances at our civil war, like this from page xi (the italics are ours):

"One question always arises when the Μαραθωνομάχης and Pindar are compared, and that is the attitude of the Theban poet during the Persian war. Was Pindar in thorough sympathy with the party of the Theban nobility to which he belonged by birth, by training, by temperament, or was he a friend of the national cause—*as it is safe to call a cause after it has been successful?*"

And again:

"It is no discredit to Pindar that *he went honestly with his State* in the struggle. It was no

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treason to Medize before there was a Greece, and the Greece that came out of the Persian war was a very different thing from the cantons that ranged themselves on this side and on that of a quarrel which, we may be sure, bore another aspect to those who stood aloof from it than it wears in the eyes of moderns, who have all learned to be Hellenic patriots. *A little experience of a losing side might aid historical vision.* That Pindar should have had an intense admiration of the New Greece, should have felt the impulse of the grand period that followed Salamis and Plataia, should have appreciated the woe that would have come on Greece had the Persians been successful, and should have seen the finger of God in the new evolution of Hellas—all this is not incompatible with an attitude during the Persian war that those who see the end and do not understand the beginning may not consider respectable."

We have not space even to enumerate the various topics which Professor Gildersleeve treats in his introductory essay. We can notice only one or two points. Under the heading "Approach to Pindar," he sketches the manner in which he thinks the artistic study of an ode should be prosecuted. He apparently agrees with the recommendation of Rauchenstein to commence with the "easier odes," but asks (p. lxiii):

"Which are the easier odes? . . . The fact is, a man who has read himself into Pindar is a poor judge of the relative difficulty of the odes unless he has made actual trial in the class-room, and the experience of most lovers of Pindar has of necessity been limited, as Pindar has seldom been read in our colleges."

We suspect that were it not for his experience in the class-room, Professor Gildersleeve would be a poor judge of the relative difficulty of different portions of the works of almost any of the Greek classical writers. His study of Greek has been so wide and so deep, so minute, we might say so microscopic, that the language has become interwoven with his intellectual constitution; all intelligible passages are to him equally easy, and a passage which is obscure or unintelligible to him, we have little doubt would have been equally obscure or unintelligible to an educated Athenian of the 80th Olympiad. He points out, however, the order in which he thinks it best to study the odes, and then the manner in which they should be studied. "The first thing to be mastered, not theoretically, but practically, is the form"; and before any attempt is made to get at its meaning, it must be read over and over aloud until the student has become perfect in the rhythmical recitation of the ode. To enable the student to do this our editor has not only given with each ode Schmidt's schemes of the metres, but he has placed dots under those syllables of the Greek text upon which the stress falls. Having mastered the rhythmical recitation of the ode, much as if it were a piece of instrumental music to be played with the voice, the next thing is to master the meaning, and here, of course, the commentary will come in. "Finally," what to many will seem a little odd—"the introduction by way of review" is to be studied. We do not think it a matter of vital importance whether the student first masters the form or the meaning so far as either can be comprehended without the other, provided he really masters both in the end; and as to the special introduction to each ode, we are quite sure that, whether for better or worse, it will be the first thing that every student will read.

As noticed above, Professor Gildersleeve has been enabled to lay before his readers the very latest results of the profound investigations of Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt, according to whom Pindar uses three fundamental forms of metre, corresponding to the 2:4 or duple, the 3:8 or triple, and the 5:8 or quintuple time of writers on music. We have no space to enter into the details of protraction, correption, and other points. We shall confine our remarks to the last species, reminding the reader that the difference between music in 5:4 and in 5:8 time is merely one of notation, and that any given piece in the one kind of time can equally well be written in the other without changing its character in any respect whatever. For a large part of the first half of the present century it was supposed that many of the peasant dances in the Palatinate and Bohemia were genuine examples of music in 5:4 or quintuple time, and many of them were so printed. But subsequent investigations have shown that this was a mistake, and that the music is really a combination of duple and triple time. Indeed, while there is no doubt that a few pieces in quintuple time have been written by modern composers, yet it is extremely doubtful whether any such music ever *grew*. An error is never fully comprehended or susceptible of complete refutation till its origin is discovered. The origin of the error of supposing that these peasant dances were in quintuple (5:4) time is easily pointed out. Any strain of music which consists of alternate bars of duple (2:4) and triple (3:4) time, or *vice versa*, can, without any essential change of its character, be converted into quintuple (5:4) time by simply omitting the alternate cross-bars. The first specimens of these dances that were reduced to writing were of this kind. Why this was the case is also clear. Out of the multitude of these dances, all equally accessible, those which were apparently in quintuple (5:4) time were the only ones the rhythm of which was intelligible to those who endeavored to reduce them to writing. But investigations of living musicians have shown that the dances which can be reduced to quintuple (5:4) time form but a small fraction of the whole number. Louis Köbler, in his collection of national dances ('Volkstänze aller Nationen der Erde,' Collection Litolff, vol. 514), has published a considerable number of these peasant dances (*Bauerntänze*). They are all marked with the double-time signature 3:4 2:4, and, unless we have made some mistake in our examination of them, there is only one in the whole number which can be reduced to quintuple (5:4) time. In all cases each section or strain is repeated. In most cases the strain commences with an anacrusis and ends with an imperfect bar, which, together with the anacrusis, when the strain is repeated, or with the anacrusis of the succeeding strain when we pass to it after repeating the preceding strain, just forms a complete bar.

It may be a matter of interest to metrical students who are acquainted with the elements of music if we give the metrical schemes of one of these dances. It can be easily done in the same manner as Schmidt's Pindaric schemes. Commencing with the first complete bar, and considering the last bar as complete for the reason mentioned above, the scheme of the first strain of No. 21 of Köhler's collection is this: 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3. Here each figure represents a bar and the number of quarter-notes or their equivalent contained in it. It will be observed that by combining two bars in one these eight bars of complex (2:4 3:4) time can be reduced to 4 of quintuple (5:4) time, so that the scheme would be: 5 5 5 5. But there is an insuperable objection to this. When so combined there would be nothing to indicate to the player whether the secondary accent should fall on the third or the fourth quarter-note, and unless the secondary accent of the quintuple bar were marked with the same clearness as the primary, the dancers would not know how to regulate the figures of the dance; that is if they counted their steps, as learners do, they would not know whether to count them 1, 2, 1, 2, 3, or 1, 2, 3, 1, 2. In other words, if the music were written in quintuple (5:4) time, both the player and the dancers would inevitably convert it into one of the forms of complex-time, either 2:4 3:4 or 3:4 2:4.

There is no definite limit to the number of ways in which duple and triple time may be combined, and perhaps the time will come when in all the Greek metres we shall be able to return to the prosodial principle, recognized for more than twenty centuries, that the only Greek syllables are shorts and longs, standing to each other in the simple ratio of 1 to 2. At any rate we feel that, although Professor Gildersleeve has given us the latest, he has not given us the last word on Greek metre and rhythm.

We will conclude with the expression of a hope, which is that the sale of this volume of the Olympian and Pythian odes may be sufficient to induce Professor Gildersleeve to prepare, and to warrant his publishers in issuing, a second volume on the same plan, containing the Nemean and Isthmean odes and all the fragments, not merely a selection. His introductory essay is in all respects adapted to a complete edition of Pindar's works. The references in those parts which treat of the dialect and syntax of Pindar are quite as numerous to the lacking portions as their comparative bulk demands. In many cases they are more numerous than the references to the odes contained in this volume; for example, under the suffix -θεν he gives one reference to a Pythian ode, while there are two to Nemean and two to Isthmean odes. Should our hope be realized, we should have an edition of Pindar which for completeness and usefulness would long remain unsurpassed; and it would serve as a specimen of American learning and scholarship of which we should all be proud.

The Campaigns of Stuart's Cavalry. By H. B. McClellan. Richmond: J. W. Randolph & English; Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1885.

THIS volume fills, and fills well, a gap in the literature connected with the civil war. Though called on the title-page, 'The Life and Campaigns of Major-General J. E. B. Stuart,' it is really a history of the cavalry of the army of Northern Virginia while under his command, but a small space being devoted to the personal history of General Stuart apart from his military career in the Confederate army. In the many narratives, more or less valuable, which have been written of the campaigns in Virginia, the operations of the cavalry have been described in a fragmentary and often in a very meagre and inadequate way. For the first time we now have a history of these operations (so far as conducted by Stuart) which gives a connected view of them as a whole. This has been done, too, by one who, as Adjutant-General of the cavalry corps, not only knows what he is talking about, but who has evidently spared no pains and labor to get at all the facts about transactions in regard to which the official reports are imperfect, or misleading, or altogether wanting. The tone of Major McClellan's book deserves unqualified praise as the frank, manly, straightforward story of a soldier who is more anxious to be just than to glorify his own side, and who can see and admire the gallant deeds of his foemen as readily as those of his comrades.

But this is only one of the excellences of the book. While the style is perfectly simple, unpretending, we may say unadorned, it is admirable for its lucidness and ease. Cavalry operations are often complicated and confused, and the battles of large bodies of horsemen, scattered as they usually are over a great extent of country, are matters not easy of description. But Major McClellan is not excelled by any writer we know in the clearness with which he sets forth the movements of troops before battle, and the well-defined, perfectly comprehensible picture he presents of battles themselves. The story of Stuart's raids is admirably told, and the great cavalry

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight, for instance, between Stuart and Pleasanton, on June 9, 1863, which opened the Gettysburg campaign, is so well set forth that, with the aid of the map, it is perfectly easy to follow the varied and intricate movements of the day without confusion and without fatigue. Major McClellan possesses the happy faculty of not overburdening his narrative with too much detail, while he yet retains enough to secure vividness. He thus describes the opening of the struggle for Fleetwood Hill, the centre and key to Stuart's position on June 9, and which, from the supineness of General Robertson, had almost fallen into General Gregg's possession before Stuart knew that he was near:

"My first courier found General Stuart as incredulous concerning the presence of the enemy in his rear as I had been at the first report of the North Carolina scout. Major Hart states that Stuart turned to him and ordered him to 'ride back there and see what all that foolishness is about.' But simultaneous with my second message . . . came the sound of the cannonading, and there was no longer room for doubt. The nearest point from which a regiment could be sent was Jones's position, one and a half miles distant from Fleetwood. The Twelfth Virginia, Col. A. W. Harman, and the Thirty-fifth Battalion, Lieut.-Col. E. V. White, were immediately withdrawn from his line, and ordered to meet this new danger. But minutes expanded seemingly into hours to those anxious watchers on the hill, who feared lest, after all, help *could* not arrive in time. But it *did* come. The emergency was so pressing that Colonel Harman had no time to form his regiment into squadrons, or even in platoons. He reached the top of the hill as Lt. Carter was retiring his gun after having fired his very last cartridge. Not fifty yards below, Col. Percy Wyndham was advancing the First New Jersey Cavalry in magnificent order, in column of squadrons, with flags and guidons flying. A hard gallop had enabled only the leading files of the Twelfth Virginia to reach the top of the hill, the rest of the regiment stretching out behind in columns of fours. It was a trying position both to the pride and courage of this regiment to be put into action in such manner that a successful charge seemed hopeless; but with the true spirit of a forlorn hope, Colonel Harman and the few men about him dashed at the advancing Federals. Stuart reached the hill a few moments later. . . .

"And now the first contest was for the possession of the Fleetwood Hill; and so stubbornly was this fought on either side, and for so long a time, that all of Jones's regiments and all of Hampton's participated in the charges and countercharges which swept across its face. . . .

"Colonel Harman was severely wounded in a personal encounter with the officer leading the Federal cavalry. Lieutenant-Colonel White, having reformed the two squadrons of his battalion, swept around the west side of the hill and charged the three guns which had been advanced to its foot. The cavalry which supported these guns was driven away. Not so, however, with the gallant gunners of the Sixth New York Battery. They had already distinguished themselves at Chancellorsville on the 2d of May under General Pleasanton, and on this occasion they stood by their guns with the most determined courage. Lieutenant-Colonel White says in his report: 'There was no demand for a surrender, nor offer to do so, until nearly all the men, with many of their horses, were either killed or wounded.'"

Major McClellan is perhaps over-careful to defend the fame of his chief against the military criticisms which have been often made on some of his operations. Stuart was one of the great cavalry leaders of the war. On the Southern side, he divides with Forrest the palm for skill, daring, and genius, and his achievements entitle him to rank among the great commanders of horse. His judgment was cool and good, his military intuitions of a very high order, his daring proverbial, his skill in handling men very great, while his physical energy and endurance had few parallels. The author has well explained the difficulties which had to be overcome in the equipment and maintenance of the Confederate cavalry, growing out of the insufficient supply of horses and arms to be had. Yet Stuart maintained an easy superiority over the Federal cavalry opposed to him during the first two years of the war. An immense improvement, however, took place in the Federal cavalry in the spring of 1863, and from this time forward the struggle was far more desperate and uncertain. Stuart was confronted by foemen worthy of his steel, and the failing resources of the Confederacy made his task increasingly arduous.

But his ability was too great, and his achievements too solid, to make it necessary to defend him from every charge of error. The saying is trite but deserves to be remembered: "The man who has made no mistakes has never fought any battles." The achievement which first gave Stuart great reputation was his daring raid around McClellan's army on the Chickahominy, and he showed ever after a *penchant* for similar operations. This first raid not only was a brilliant feat, but it conduced in the highest degree to the success of Lee's plan of campaign against McClellan. Indeed, that campaign may be said to have been based upon the information that Stuart brought. But no such importance, either in design or result, attached to the Chambersburg raid; and while the skill and boldness with which it was conducted were creditable in the highest degree, the exhaustion due to it probably counterbalanced the advantages secured.

One of Stuart's great days was that on which he commanded Jackson's Corps at Chancellorsville, and, after a fierce and sanguinary struggle, wrested victory from Hooker. Arriving on the field at midnight, when the operations of the corps had been for some hours paralyzed by the fall of Jackson, he showed immense energy in acquainting himself with the condition of the field and the disposition of the troops, and deserves great credit for the vigor and skill of his attack next morning. He fought out the battle according to his own conceptions of the situation, instead of attempting to carry out Jackson's ideas. In this he was right; but it does not follow that, had Jackson been permitted to complete his own movement of the night before, even more striking results might not have been obtained.

In regard to Stuart's movements before Gettysburg, Major McClellan has said well what can be said in behalf of his chief, and he has not hesitated to criticise him—mildly, it is true—for sacrificing time of inestimable value for the sake of saving a train of captured wagons or paroling a few hundred prisoners. There can be no question but that General Lee's instructions allowed Stuart great latitude in consonance with the confidence which Lee reposed in the indefatigable commander of his horse, but it is just as certain that his prolonged absence was unexpected and severely felt by Lee, and that to this absence the battle of Gettysburg, at least as to manner and place, was due.

The brief sketch of Stuart's life before the war, the account of his participation in the capture of John Brown, and the glimpses given of his personal character and habits, add much to the charm of this interesting book; and we can only wish that the author had dwelt more on the personality of a soldier not more renowned for his brave deeds than for his singularly pure and lovable character. No deed of cruelty to citizen, no outrage upon woman, has ever been laid to his charge. Courteous as brave, running over with a joyous gayety which nothing could depress, he was hardly less earnest in his religious convictions than Stonewall Jackson himself.

The oversights are few. On page 88 Morse's Neck should be Moss Neck, and on page 386 Hanover Junction is once printed when Warrenton Junction is meant. Rosser and the horse artillery hardly receive the credit they deserve for their part in the fight at the Boonsboro' gap, September 14, 1862. On page 129 it is not accurate to speak of Starke's division as reinforcing Lawton, as both were engaged at the same time and on different parts of the line. The book has been well got up by the publishers, and the maps are unusually good.

Königliche Museen zu Berlin: Die Gipsabgüsse, etc. [*Royal Museums of Berlin:* The Plaster Casts of Ancient Sculpture explained in Historical Sequence. Materials for the History of Greek and Roman Plastic Art. By Carl Friedrichs. Revised by Paul Wolters.] Berlin: Spemann. 1885. Pp. x, 850.—Beschreibung der Vasensammlung im Antiquarium. [Description of the Collection of Vases in the Antiquarium.] By Adolph Furtwangler. 1 vol. in 2 parts, pp. xxx, 1105, 7 plates. Berlin: Spemann. 1885.

The Museum of Berlin (to class as one the many royal or national collections of the Prussian capital) is rich in vases and painted terracottas; and this collection may even be considered as peculiarly good for purposes of study and comparison, although it cannot be put in the first rank for the number and importance of its separate pieces of peculiar value and rarity. Large and very judicious purchases have been made during the past few years: in 1880, for instance, the collection of six hundred votive tablets from Corinth was obtained in one transaction, and not long before had been procured the extraordinary painted frieze from Athens; while remarkable single pieces, notably some with decoration partly in gold, have been added within a very few months. They are not very well displayed for the purposes of the ordinary student, who must look at them through the glass of the cases. Nearly all departments of the Berlin Museum are crowded.

The great cast collection, especially, is so much too large for its halls and corridors that it is really impossible to get far enough away from its most important pieces to see them properly. But there it is, filling ten halls of different sizes, besides landings of stairs and small passages; not very rich in Mediæval and Renaissance specimens, and much too purely *German* in the former department, but in classic sculpture by far the largest gathering in Europe. In fact, as has already been set forth in these columns, what with the few original pieces of value in the old collections—the Pergamon originals—the Olympia casts, which have their headquarters in Berlin, and are housed by themselves not far off, and the general collection housed in the "New Museum" building, Berlin may be said to have all the important classical sculptures that exist above ground, for the delectation of its students. The cast collection alone, including the Olympia finds, and as given in the book before us, contains 2,271 numbers of classical sculpture only.

The two books under consideration are excellent companions to the study of these collections, and so discharge their first duty as *catalogues*, but not in this capacity would they claim much attention from stay-at-home students. They are also excellent companions in the study, and nobly make up for the shortcomings of the professed histories and handbooks. For what is the fault of the histories and handbooks?—that they explain and discuss and draw general conclusions without giving examples enough to help the reader make up his own mind. Take the history of Greek sculpture, of which we have several good examples of late, and see what pages of disquisition have only two or three examples cited as the ground for these conclusions and convictions. The reader longs for more: he wants to know how many such reliefs or statues there are above ground; he would like to help the author reach his decisions, and asks for material to work upon. This the "history" cannot give, but the mere catalogue, "in historischer Folge erklärt,"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does nicely. It gives its chronological list, with sizes and places where discovered, from five to fifty lines of minute description, with careful reference to any other piece which shows similar or contrasted qualities; and, finally, it mentions all, or as near as may be all, the books and periodicals in which the piece in question has been described, and especially those in which a picture of it has been given. After you have read about your statue in the history you are at work upon, in Overbeck, or Reber, or Lübke, or Murray, or Perry, or Mitchell, or Rouget, you turn to our Friedrichs-Wolters catalogue to find an exact, minute, feature-by-feature account of it, the injuries and the repairs it has suffered, the restorations you must eliminate before you judge it, and also to find where else it has been pictured or described.

Evidently, for this purpose, the sculpture catalogue is far more important than the other. The vases in the Berlin Museum—those individual specimens—are probably unknown to, and certainly not easily to be reached by, the reader in an American library; but the statues and reliefs which Berlin has in plaster are the immortal and well-known ones, whose bronze or marble originals are in Athens, or Naples, or London, but whose plaster duplicates are here and there, wherever one chooses to have them brought, at small expense, and photographs and photogravures of them are immensely more accessible still. The spear-bearer which this catalogue describes at length may be seen rendered, it explains, in this book and in that, here better and there not quite so well; and the books so cited are *not* so unobtainable but that every moderate-sized town might have them all.

Carl Friedrichs's own 'Bausteine zur Geschichte der Griechisch-römischen Plastik' was published in 1868: it has been a much-used and highly valued book ever since, and had grown to be completely out of print, almost unobtainable. Two years ago, our readers will remember, Mr. D. Cady Eaton published an English translation of it at New Haven. The present admirable reissue of the original is Friedrichs's book still; the principal changes being in the great increase of matter with which it has had to deal. As it stands, no better or more critical work on the subject exists. If this were a review-article, there would be plenty of questions to raise, opinions of the author to challenge, and so on; but actual and undoubted faults and errors in the text seem hard to pitch upon. We may be excused for hinting to an audience who like short German sentences with a visible verb better than the other kind, that the German style of this book is as simple as Overbeck's (for instance) is long-winded, involved, and slow of comprehension.

And so we come to the Index, and it must be said that the Friedrichs-Wolters is poorly furnished. There is an index, but it is very inadequate. One great, almost fatal, shortcoming is that it classifies sculptures only under the names of the supposed subjects: but what is called here a *Hermes* the English reader may have known as Apollo, or as Achilles, and the modern-equipped archæologist may consider an Ephebos simply; and, in short, one knows not where to look. The simple remedy would be to give also the place where the sculpture is, "Patissia Museum," or "Japan Palace, Dresden"; also the finding-place, where known, or in place of it the *provenance*, like "Farnese collection," or the like. The vase catalogue has excellent and complete indexes.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Bellows, Rev. H. W. Twenty-four Sermons Preached in All Souls' Church, New York, 1865–81. Edited by his son, R. N. Bellows. New York: The Editor.
Bamford, Mrs. C. E. Silk Culture. A Handbook for Silk Growers. O. Judd Co.
Blake, C. E. A Lexicon of the first Three Books of Homer's Iliad. D. Appleton & Co.

Fine Arts.

SALMAGUNDI EXHIBITION.

THE eighth exhibition of the Salmagundi Club, now open "under the auspices of the American Art Association," seems most appropriately named, there being three distinct exhibitions under the same roof, and visible for the price of one admission, thus forming practically one large collection of very varied contents. They are: the Salmagundi exhibition proper, the first annual exhibition of architectural drawings, and the collection of "out-door water colors" by Mr. F. K. M. Rehn.

The first thing one notices about the Salmagundi exhibition is the comparative absence from it of anything like real drawings. A collection of black-and-white studies—of such drawings as artists make in the preparation of their pictures—would be of great interest and value, and one is somewhat surprised by the absence of such studies. Perhaps the reason is to be found in a clause of the circulars of the club to the effect that "works intended for sale will be given the preference." The result of such an announcement is naturally to deter artists from sending any of their serious drawings made purely for artistic study, and to encourage the production, especially for this exhibition, of a sort of pictures painted in gouache or black and white oil, and "intended for sale." These pictures emulate to some extent the completeness of works in color, minus the color, and have an advantage over the latter in that they are much easier to do, and can consequently be sold at a cheaper rate. It seems to us that the only reason for existence of these processes is in their convenience for book illustration, and that, considered in any other light than as preparations for engraving, they are essentially vicious. In too many cases the facility of daubing has led the performer away from any serious study of form, while the comparative ineffectiveness of carefully studied values without the aid of color has been equally fatal to real study of light and shade. The result has been a reliance on mere effect—a spot of white against a spot of black—of the kind so familiar to us in the popular magazine illustrations. When done for the engravers such work has at least this advantage, that such quality as it has any engraver can render, whereas fine drawing or delicate tone is liable to be cut to pieces by all but the very best men; but done for itself, and without such ulterior aim, we cannot see that it possesses any serious value whatever. It is a direct training of falseness of vision in the artist, and is a debaucher of the public taste.

These general remarks will show why we do not devote much space to the consideration of individual drawings. We shall only notice a few of the more prominent exceptions. One of the most notable of these is a "Study" by F. D. Millet, which seems really to *be* a study. It is a pencil drawing of a female figure in antique costume, done with much delicacy of handling and considerable beauty of line. Many of the best drawings in the exhibition are veritable illustrations, and the frequency with which the Century Co., Harper Bros., and other publishing firms appear in the catalogue as owners strikes one at the first glance. There are two considerable sets of such designs, Mr. Kappes's illustrations of 'The Idyls of the King' and Mr. Shirlaw's illustrations of Goldsmith's 'Hermit,' besides a number of drawings which have appeared at different times in the magazines. We should like to praise Mr. Kappes's designs more heartily than we are able to do. They are evidently the outcome of much labor and sincerity of purpose, and those that deal least with the figure are sometimes quite effective; but his subject has demanded a science of the figure which he unfortunately does not possess, and with the best intentions he occasionally produces distressing results, as in "Vivien's Wiles," for example, where the bewitching lady is presented to us in a form anything but bewitching. Mr. Shirlaw's illustrations appear twice—in the originals and in Mr. Juengling's engravings—and, good engraver as Mr. Juengling is, he has hardly done justice to Mr. Shirlaw. Affected and theatrical the drawings are, but they are not without a certain rococo charm, most of which has evaporated under the engraver's ruder touch. Mr. Smedley has a number of illustrations which show his usual refinement and delicacy, and Mr. De Thulstrup has some dashing Indian subjects; there is much good, sober work in Mr. Burns's "Lost in the Fog," and Mr. Gaul's spirited "Urgent Despatch" is better work than we have seen from him lately. Lastly, there is some drawing of an unusually good sort in Mr. Charles Osborne's meagre nude study with a long and enigmatical title.

To the non-professional mind architectural drawings are apt to seem rather arid, and to convey little idea of the building, real or projected, that they illustrate, and this is certainly true of a large portion of the present collection, though not of all of it. Of the merits or demerits as architecture of the buildings here drawn we have nothing to say, but some of the drawings are very beautiful as drawings. The catalogue is very confusing, making no distinction between the architect of a building and the draughtsman, so that on one supposition—that warranted by the wording—Messrs. Swain Gifford and Hopkinson Smith appear as the architects of various famous buildings in Europe, while on another, drawings by Mr. Alfred Brennan, Mr. Harry Fenn, and others, are attributed to the architect who planned the buildings they have drawn. It is therefore impossible to tell, in the absence of other information, whether Mr. C. H. Walker is or is not a veritable architect, but what is certain is that he is a most accomplished painter in water colors. His drawings of several foreign churches are very lovely, with a combination of precision of information and picturesqueness of effect very rare to see, and are simple and direct in method and beautiful in color. Before we get away from the catalogue, let us mention that the first part of it is not altogether impeccable, a clever head of a "Matador" by W. A. Coffin appearing, no doubt to the disgust of the artist, as a "Mastodon" by W. *H.* Coffin! A charming bit of detail work, only partially carried out, is a fragment of Giotto's Tower, by H. B. Warren. Other things of the more purely architectural type possessing interest as drawings are a blotty, clever sketch of a part of Amiens Cathedral by Cass Gilbert, and some sketches of furniture, etc., by R. Brown. Mr. Gifford's contributions are, naturally, very different from any of these, being heavily painted with a good deal of gouache, and with more care for color and effect than for precision of detail. They are, in fact, *pictures*, and are only "architectural" by reason of the subjects. It seems to us that the buildings are, on the whole, better than the landscape.

Two of the American Art Association's rooms are filled with Mr. Rehn's "out-door water-colors," but of these we have little to say. The epithet probably corresponds more closely to the historical fact of their production than to any intrinsic quality of the works themselves. They are good, workmanlike productions of the conventional sort, and their quantity, as the result of one season's work, speaks volumes for the honorable industry of their author, especially when one considers that they were probably the employment of the moments when his work in oil was for any reason interrupted; but they hardly show any such originality or vitality as to call for extended notice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Messrs. HENRY HOLT & CO.,

29 West 23d St., New York,

WILL PUBLISH

JANUARY 15:

SIR HENRY SUMNER MAINE'S

POPULAR GOVERNMENT. Four Essays: I. Prospects of Popular Government. II. Nature of Democracy. III. Age of Progress. IV. Constitution of the United States. 8vo, $3.00.

DR. EDWARD ZELLER'S

OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY of Greek Philosophy. Translated, with the author's sanction, by Sarah Frances Alleyne and Evelyn Abbott. 12mo, $1.75.

*MICHAEL FIELD'S "THE FA*ther's Tragedy," "William Rufus," and "Loyalty or Love." 1 vol., 12mo, $1.75.

"Will the pseudonym of 'Michael Field' become greater even than that of 'George Eliot'? It is hard to say. . . . We cannot read twenty lines anywhere without finding traces of a strong genius and a great dramatic imagination."—*London Spectator.*

AFTER HIS KIND. A Romantic Novel of English Rural Life, with an American Hero. By John Coventry. 16mo. Leisure Hour Series. $1.

French, German, Spanish, Italian.

You can, by ten weeks' study, master either of these languages sufficiently for every-day and business conversation, by Dr. Rich. S. Rosenthal's celebrated Meisterschaft System. Terms, $5.00 for books of each language, with privilege of answers to all questions, and correction of exercises. Sample copy, part I, 25 cents. Liberal terms to teachers.

MEISTERSCHAFT PUBLISHING CO.,
Herald Building, Boston, Mass.

The Harvard University Catalogue for 1885-6.

Is for sale by CHAS. W. SEVER, Cambridge, CUPPLES, UPHAM & CO., 283 Washington St., Boston: and F. W. CHRISTERN, 37 West 23d St., New York. Price, post-paid, 60 cents.

RECORD OF POLITICS and Politicians in the United States, 1865-1882: An analytical index to the *Nation* for that period (with occasional parallel references to McPherson's Political Handbooks and other sources). This index supplements the chiefly literary index to the *Nation* published in 1880. Valuable to all libraries, students, and editors. Price, in paper, $1 00. (Purchasers will please remit with order; accounts cannot be opened.) Address PUBLISHER of the *Nation*, Box 794, New York City.

*FOR ADVANCED FRENCH STU*dents.—An interesting French European Magazine: Tales, History, Poetry, Plays, Travels, Riddles, Exercises, etc. An invaluable aid for all destrous of retaining or extending their knowledge of French. 26 numbers a year, post paid, for $1.10. Specimen numbers mailed to any address. E. ROTH,
337 S. Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.

FIRST-CLASS BOARD in a refined German Family at Leipsic, Germany. Excellent opportunity for parents wishing to have their children educated in Europe. For particulars address BERNHARD GERHARD, 53 Arndtstrasse, Leipsic, Germany; or W. P. GERHARD, 6 Astor Place, N. Y. City.

Free Manufacturing Sites at Pittsburgh, with Natural Gas.

A getleman wishes to improve a large property. Sites unexcelled; Natural Gas; Navigable River; Railroads; cheap coal; all advantages. Address WHITNEY & STEPHENSON, Brokers, 612 Liberty Street, Pittsburgh; or A. LEGGATE, 31 Federal Street, Allegheny City, Pa.

*I WILL AGAIN RECEIVE AND DIS*tribute reading matter for the South and Southwest. Books, magazines, reviews, the *Nation*, all Government reports and public documents, college reports, etc. Express charges must be paid to this point.
J. B. HARRISON, Franklin Falls, New Hampshire.

*SCHOOL BOOKS IN FOREIGN LAN*guages. Miscellaneous Books in Foreign Languages. Catalogues on application. Foreign Periodicals.
CARL SCHOENHOF, Importer, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

D. Appleton & Co.

PUBLISH THIS DAY:

I.

Marlborough.

By George Saintsbury. Being Volume Two of a New Biographic Series, entitled "ENGLISH WORTHIES," edited by Andrew Lang. Small 12mo, cloth. Price, 75 cents.

Volume One of "English Worthies" was 'Charles Darwin,' by Grant Allen. This series will consist of Biographies of Englishmen of influence and distinction, past and present, military, naval, literary, scientific, legal, ecclesiastical, social, etc. Each Biography will be intrusted to a writer specially acquainted with the historical period in which his hero lived, and in special sympathy, as it were, with his subject.

II.

Protection vs. Free Trade.

THE SCIENTIFIC VALIDITY AND ECONOMIC OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE DUTIES IN THE UNITED STATES. By Henry M. Hoyt. 12mo, cloth. Price, $2.00.

The author of this work is well known as formerly Governor of Pennsylvania. He appears in this volume as a defender of protection, discussing the subject in a judicial spirit, with great fulness, quoting copiously from eminent free-trade writers, in order that the reader may have both sides of the question before him. It is probably the fullest statement of the protection argument that has been made.

III.

Donovan: A Modern Englishman.

A NOVEL. By Edna Lyall. 12mo, cloth. Price, $1.50.

'Donovan' is a novel that has been attracting a great deal of attention in England, especially among more serious readers. It is a religious novel, the hero of which is a free-thinker, and the story consists of a struggle between doubt and faith.

"This is a very admirable work. It should do as much good as the best sermon ever written or delivered extempore. The story is told with a grand simplicity, an unconscious poetry of eloquence which stirs the very depths of the heart."—*London Standard.*

IV.

The Broken Shaft:

TALES IN MID-OCEAN. Told by F. Marion Crawford, R. Louis Stevenson, F. Anstey, W. H. Pollock, William Archer, and others. 12mo, paper. Price, 25 cents.

'The Broken Shaft' should attract many readers, first, by the great reputation of its contributors, and second, by the startling nature of its contents. Mr. F. Marion Crawford tells a ghost story; Mr. Louis Stevenson's contribution has a ghost and a murder; Mr. Anstey has a ghost and a case of manslaughter; W. H. Pollock, the editor of the *Saturday Review*, contributes a dramatic tragedy: and Mr. William Archer, a thrilling story of a secret society.

*** *For sale by all booksellers; or will be sent by the publishers, by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price.*

1, 3, and 5 Bond Street, New York.

BROWN, BROTHERS & CO.,

59 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS
For use in
THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

*SPECIAL TREATMENT OF ALCO*holism at the private residence of a retired physician in the Adirondack region.
Address A,
BOX 1135,
New York City.

CRITICAL AND SOCIAL ESSAYS.—Reprinted from the *Nation*, and in some measure supplying the place of the first two volumes of the paper, now very scarce. Cloth, 12mo, price $1.50. Sent, post-paid, on receipt of price.
HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

An eminent medical authority says: "The most dangerous season to persons suffering from any form of Kidney Disease is the severe winter weather, such as the present, owing to the fact that these organs are overworked by reason of increased action in carrying off the liquids of the body, which, in milder temperature, are thrown off through the medium of perspiration."

Buffalo Lithia Water.

Never in the annals of the trade has a mineral water been placed upon the market the reputation and value of which have been so firmly established and so largely enhanced by eminent physicians and surgeons, and the results attained so remarkably and uniformly successful in the treatment of Kidney Disease, Diabetes, Bright's Disease of the Kidneys, Gout, Rheumatism, Dyspepsia, Indigestion, Lithiasis of the Blood, Albuminaria, and that widely prevalent and dreaded disease, Malaria, as the justly celebrated water from the Buffalo Lithia Springs of Mecklenburg County, Virginia. For the past ten years this wonderful remedial agent has steadily grown in popular favor by virtue of its high standing in the estimation of the medical faculty, and this fact is its most powerful recommendation. No meretricious efforts have been made, no subterfuges resorted to, no deception practised in bringing it to their attention. That they are so widely recognizing its merits and so freely prescribing its use speaks volumes for the inherent merit of its wonderful properties and curative powers, and warrants the proprietors in more earnest efforts to bring it to the attention of sufferers from the many forms of uric-acid poisoning.

Dr. J. Marion Sims, of New York, a most eminent authority, said: "I have used in my practice the Buffalo Lithia Water for two years past, and have, in many cases, found it *highly efficacious.*"

Dr. William A. Hammond, of New York, Surgeon-General of United States (Retired), wrote: "I have for some time made use of the Buffalo Lithia Water in cases of Affections of the *Nervous System*, complicated with *Bright's Disease of the Kidneys*, or with *Gouty Diathesis. The results have been eminently successful.*"

Dr. Alfred L. Loomis, of the Medical Department, University of New York, says: "In all *Gouty* and *Rheumatic Affections I regard it as highly efficacious.*"

Testimonials of the same high grade might be indefinitely multiplied were it deemed necessary, but the very high standing of these gentlemen in their profession, commands the attention of all intelligent and thoughtful people who are seeking a remedy of genuine and acknowledged merit.

Pamphlets setting forth the peculiar values of this water, and containing testimonials from reliable sources, will be mailed free to any address.

FOR SALE BY

All Druggists and Mineral Water Dealers.

VIRGINIA BUFFALO LITHIA SPRINGS CO.

Wholesale Depot, 33 Barclay Street,
NEW YORK.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED